DWIGHT O. CRIM
1950

THE

# MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

EDITED BY

## ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

---

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

---

VOL. I.

---

BETHANY, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR

1830.

*Reproduced and Issued*
*by the*
OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB
5646 ROCKHILL ROAD
KANSAS CITY 4, MISSOURI
1950

# THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 1. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, JANUARY* 4, 1830. Vol. I.


I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## PROSPECTUS.

THIS work shall be devoted to the destruction of sectarianism, infidelity, and antichristian doctrine and practice. It shall have for its object the developement and introduction of that political and religious order of society called THE MILLENNIUM, which will be the consummation of that ultimate amelioration of society proposed in the Christian Scriptures. Subservient to this comprehensive object, the following subjects shall be attended to:—

1. The incompatibility of any sectarian establishment, now known on earth, with the genius of the glorious age to come.

2. The inadequacy of all the present systems of education, literary and moral, to develope the powers of the human mind, and to prepare man for rational and social happiness.

3. The disentanglement of the Holy Scriptures from the perplexities of the commentators and system-makers of the dark ages. This will call for the analysis of several books in the New Testament, and many disquisitions upon the appropriated sense of the leading terms and phrases in the Holy Scriptures and in religious systems.

4. The *injustice* which yet remains in many of the political regulations under the best political governments, when contrasted with the *justice* which christianity proposes, and which the millennial order of society promises.

5. Disquisitions upon the treatment of African slaves, as preparatory to their emancipation, and exaltation from their present degraded condition.

6. General religious news, or regular details of the movements of the religious combinations, acting under the influence of the proselyting spirit of the age.

7. Occasional notices of religious publications, including reviews of new works, bearing upon any of the topics within our precincts.

8. Answers to interesting queries of general utility, and notices of all things of universal interest to all engaged in the proclamation of the *Ancient Gospel* and a *Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things*.

9. Miscellanea; or, religious, moral, and literary varieties.

Much of the useful learning which has been sanctified to the elucidation of those interesting and sublime topics of christian expectation.

will, we intend, be gleaned from the christian labors of those distinguished men of liberal minds, who are ranked among the most renowned Fathers of christian literature; and much aid is expected from a few of the more enlightened brethren of our own time, who are fellow-laborers and pioneers in hastening this wished-for period. It is intended to give every family into which this work shall come, so much of the religious news of the day, and such a variety of information on all the topics submitted, as to make it a work of much interest to the young and inquisitive.

The indulgence and patronage which have been extended to me, as Editor of the *Christian Baptist*, embolden me to attempt a work of still greater magnitude—expecting that if that work, written (as the greater part of it was) under very disadvantageous circumstances, and while my attention was divided between other works and a multiplicity of other business, obtained so general a circulation, and was so well received—a work to which a much a larger portion of my energies shall be devoted, will not fail of obtaining, at least, an equal patronage, and proving proportionally more useful, as the range will be so much greater, and the object one in which all Christians, of every name, must feel interested; and especially, as there is not, perhaps, in the christian world, any work published with the same design, and embracing the same outlines.

CONDITIONS.

Having purchased a large fount of beautiful new type, of a good medium size, and a first rate new printing press, we may promise a beautiful impression, on good paper.

1. Each number shall contain 48 pages, large duodecimo, equal to a medium octavo, or equal in superficies to more than 63 pages of the *Christian Baptist*. Being printed on super-royal paper, it will cost to the subscribers only twice as much postage as the *Christian Baptist*, though containing more than twice and a half times as much matter. With a good index, it will make a volume of 600 pages per annum.

2. It shall be published on the first Monday of every month—the first number to be issued on the first Monday of January, 1830.—Each number shall be stitched, in a good cover; and all numbers failing to reach their destination shall be made good at the expense of the Editor.

3. It shall cost, exclusive of postage, *Two Dollars and Fifty Cents* to all who do not pay until the close of the year; but to those who pay in advance, or within six months after subscribing, *Two Dollars* will be accepted.

4. Post-Masters, who act as Agents, shall have ten per cent. for obtaining subscribers, and for collecting and remitting the amount of their subscriptions.

5. All other persons who obtain and pay for five subscribers, within six months from subscribing, shall have one copy gratis. But to those who do not guaranty and pay within that period, ten per cent. on all the subscribers, for whom they make payment, shall be allowed.

6. Persons who subscribe at any time within the year, will be furnished with the volume from the commencement. And no person, unless at the discretion of the Editor, shall be permitted to withdraw until all arrearages are paid.

7. All who do not notify their discontinuance to our agents in such time that we may be informed a month before the close of each volume, will be considered as subscribers for the next volume.

N. B. Let all subscribers be careful to name the post-office to which they wish their papers sent.

*Bethany, Brooke county, Va.*

## PREFATORY REMARKS.

TIME, the great innovator, brings to pass every thing. Gradual but unceasing is its march. It never slumbers. It never pauses. It gives maturity to every thing.

When we are taught to read the volume of Nature, or rather the great library of God, and have made some proficiency in the volume of Revelation, we discover that there is an admirable analogy between the volumes of Creation and Redemption. As is the progress of natural, so has been the progress of supernatural light. First, there are the glimmerings of dawn—then the twilight—then the risen day, and then the radiance of noon. So is not only the faith of the just, which brightens more and more until the perfect day; but also such are the developements of the light of life.

Starlight and moonlight ages are no more. The *Sun of Mercy* has arisen. But as in the natural, so in the moral world, there are clouds and obscurations. There are interceptions of the light of the sun. There are eclipses partial and total. In a total eclipse there is the darkness of night. There have been both partial and total eclipses of the Sun of Mercy since his rising. Not only have there been cloudy and dark days, but actual darkness like that of night.

Had not a thick vapor arisen from the unfathomable abyss and hid the Sun of Mercy and of Life from human eyes, neither *the beast* nor *the false prophet* could have been born. Wild beasts go forth in the night, and in darkness commit their depredations. So the apocalyptic "*wild beast*" was the creature of night and of darkness.

Vapors arise from the waters, and from the unfathomable ocean* the densest fogs arise. When we dream of troubles, we wade through deep waters. Hence, the commotions and troubled agitations of communities, are symbolized by the waters of the great abyss.—From these commotions, these deep waters, arose the symbolic fog, the figurative vapors which overspread the heavens and hid the Sun of Righteousness from the eyes of mortals. The volumes of traditions, the cabalistic dogmas, the eastern philosophy, the pagan speculations, combined and modified, intercepted entirely, or totally eclipsed the light of the moral sun. Nearly all the earth was overspread in

**Called in the King's Translation* "the bottomless pit;" *but most improperly. The sea was usually called the unfathomable abyss.*

this darkness. The middle of this period has properly been called "the dark ages."

Though the eclipse was total in Rome, it was not so every where. But the fairest portions of the Old World shared in it, and it was partial almost every where, where it was not total.

*Why was this so?* is one question; but, *Was it so?* is another. That it was so needs no proof, because all agree in the belief of this fact. We know some reasons, which may yet be offered, why it was so. But now we only appeal to the fact that it was so. This darkness has been only partially dissipated.

The Bible was brought out of prison, and Luther bid it march. He made it speak in German, and thus obtained for it a respectful hearing. It was soon loaded with immense burthens of traditions, drawn from the cloisters and the cells where it had so long been incarcerated. It soon became unable to travel with its usual speed—and then stopped the Reformation. They took the points off the arrows of truth, and blunted the sword of the Spirit, so that the enemies of the truth could not be conquered.

About the commencement of the present century, finding that notes and comments, that glosses and traditions were making the word of God of little or no effect—I say, the pious of several of the great phalanxes of the rival *christian* interests did agree to unmanacle and unfetter the testimony of God, and send it forth without the bolsters and crutches furnished by the schools; and this, with the spirit of inquiry which it created and fostered, has contributed much to break the yoke of clerical oppression, which so long oppressed the people—I say, *clerical* oppression; for this has been, and yet is, though much circumscribed, the worst of all sorts of oppression. The understandings, the consciences, the feelings, the bodies and the estates of men have been seized by this most relentless of tyrants. All who have demanded the first fruits and tithes; all who have paralyzed the mind and forced the assent, or secured the homage of the conscience, have not been tyrants. Neither have all they who have rejected and reprobated this system, been humane, courteous, and merciful.—There are exceptions even among priests. If the clergy never could reform the system, the system always could reform them. To repudiate the system, is to desecrate the priest; and whosoever has profaned or made common the priests, has been not only unchurched, but unchristianized. Such have been the past fates of those who ventured to depart from the consecrated way. But a new order of things has, within the memory of the present generation, begun. Many of the priests have become obedient to the faith, and the natural, political, and religious rights of men have begun to be much better understood. All these auguries are favorable to the hopes of the expectants of the restoration of the ancient order of things. But nothing has so much contributed to the hopes of the intelligent, and nothing can more conduce to the regeneration of the church, than the disentanglement of the Holy Oracles from the intricacies of the variant

rules of interpretation which the textuaries have fashioned into a system the most repugnant to all we call reason, common sense, and analogy.

In the happiest state which we can ever expect on earth, we can only, as individuals, enjoy as much of the favor of God as the most intelligent and devout of the first converts; and, as communities, we could enjoy no more christian peace and joy than some of the first congregations after the first promulgation of the gospel. Greater temporal felicity might be enjoyed, but the spiritual attainments of many of the congregations cannot, in the aggregate mass of religious communities, be much, if at all, surpassed.

Place the whole of any community, or even the great mass of any community, under influences similar to those which governed them, and what the most sanguine expect from a Millennium would in social and religious enjoyments be realized. But there is no fixing bounds to the maximum of social and refined bliss which would flow from the very general or universal prevalence and triumphs of evangelical principles. To see a whole nation bowing, with grateful and joyous homage to the King Eternal, immortal, and invisible, mingling all their affections in their admiration and love of him who had obtained immortality for man, would open a new fountain of enjoyments of which we have not yet tasted. To see even a few scores of intelligent christians, in whom we confide as fellow-soldiers and fellow-citizens, and joint heirs of the heavenly inheritance, meeting around one and the same Lord's table, and uniting in the praises and adorations of one and the same common Lord and Saviour, imparts to us a joy which we are unable to express. What we should feel, or how we should feel, among myriads of such, is not for us now to conjecture. But of this in its proper place.

All I wish to remark on this occasion, is, that the first step towards the introduction of this glorious age, is to dissipate the darkness which covers the people and hides from their eyes the Sun, the quickening, renewing, animating Sun of Mercy. We expect no new Sun, no new revelation of the Spirit, no other than the same gospel and the same religion, only that it shall be disinterred from the rubbish of the dark ages, and made to assume its former simplicity, sublimity, and majesty. The demons of party must be dispossessed, and the false spirits cast out. The human mind must be emancipated from the bondage of error, and information not only augmented, but extended to all the community.

Light is certainly increasing—charity enlarging the circle of its activities—the mountains of discord diminishing, and the deep vallies which separated christians, are filling up. But much is to be done before all flesh shall enjoy the salvation of God. If all who love the Lord and the salvation of men, would unite their energies and bury the tomahawk of party conflicts, no seer could predict how rapid would be the march and how extensive the triumphs of the gospel.

But the mighty agent, or rather the successful means, of this most desirable revolution, will be the *Ancient Gospel*. There are many gospels now preached. The gospels of every sect are something

different from each other, and something different from the apostolic. There can be, in truth, but *one* gospel; but there may be many new-modified and perverted gospels. Some make their own god and worship him; and all who create a new god invent a gospel to suit his character. Surely no man of good common sense can imagine that the god of the Calvinists and the god of the Arminians are the same god. He that fancies that the god of the Trinitarians and the god of the Unitarians are one and the same divinity, can easily believe in transubstantiation.

The wisdom and the power of God, when combined, will be surely adequate to accomplish the most extraordinary promises on record. Now the placing of all nations under the dominion of his Son, under the reign of favor, under the influence of all that is pure, amiable, and heavenly, is promised; and by what means so likely to be accomplished as by that instrument which is emphatically called the wisdom and power of the Almighty? That instrument is the old gospel preached by the Apostles. This is almighty, through God, to the pulling down all the strong holds of infidelity and profanity, to the subversion of Atheism, Deism, and Sectarianism. It proved its power upon the nations once, and it begins to prove its power again. The sword of the Spirit has been muffled with the filthy rags of philosophy and mysticism until it cannot cut through the ranks of the aliens. But so soon as this gospel is promulged in its old simplicity and in its native majesty, it will prove itself to be of God, and as adequate as in days of yore. It will pierce the hearts of the King's enemies; and, while it slays their enmity, it will reconcile them to the authority and government of the Prince of Peace.

In prosecuting one of the great objects of this paper, and, indeed, the leading object, this point will not be lost sight of. Our modern gospels, like the metaphysics of the schools, have been inoperative, except to alienate men from one another, and to fill some with spiritual pride, and to abase others under a morose humility. Here we see them exulting in enthusiasm, and there melancholy under a system of doubts. Between these two classes there is the opinionative, the speculative, the cold and stiff formalist—exact in the ceremonies, and precise in all the forms of religion, without the power. Some, from a bolder and more independent mind, and from a happier constitutional temperament, dared to be pious and to aspire after a high enjoyment of the spirit of religion. But these do not give character to the age.

One of the two great reformers attacked the *practices*, and the other the *opinions** of the earlier part of the sixteenth century. The former was by far the most useful and puissant reformer. He gave the deadliest blow to *the beast*. The other, intent on making men think right, only made converts from among the converted. This has always been the case. As Luther excelled Calvin, so did Wesley excel the Erskines. They both began upon communities called Protestants,

*Each of them attacked both sentiment and practice; but I mean one of them paid chief regard to practice—the other, to correct views.

but degenerating Protestants. Wesley directed his energies to the works of men, and the Erskines to their heterodox opinions. Wesley excelled his own more metaphysical brother, Fletcher. Fletcher was as far superior to Wesley as a reasoner and metaphysician, as Calvin was to Luther. But, as a reformer, Wesley was as far superior to Fletcher as Luther was to Calvin. The reason is obvious: the gospel called for a change of conduct—for obedience on new principles. It presented great operative principles, but called for immediate submission to new institutions. Luther's plan was more in unison with this than Calvin's; and Wesley's more than Fletcher's. Hence more visible and more useful in their tendencies. Practical men always have been the most useful; and, therefore, practical principles have been more beneficial to mankind than the most ingenious and refined speculations. Symmes might have amusingly lectured a thousand years upon his visions and his fancies; but Christopher Columbus, in one voyage, added a new world to the old one.

The ancient gospel spoke by facts, and said little about principles of action of any sort. The facts, when realized or believed, carried principles into the heart without naming them; and there was an object presented which soon called them into action. It was the true philosophy, without the name, and made all the philosophy of the world sublimated folly. It was ridiculous to hear Epicureans and Stoics reasoning against Paul. While they were talking about atoms of matter and refined principles, about virtue and vice, Paul took hold of the *resurrection of the dead*, and buried them in their own dreams. He preached Jesus and the Resurrection; he proclaimed reformation and forgiveness of sins; and before they awoke out of their reveries, he had Dionysius the Mayor of the City, the Lady Damaris, and other notable characters, immersed into Jesus.

The ancient gospel left no man in a reasoning mode about any principle of action. It left him in no doubt about the qualities or attributes of faith. It called for the obedience of faith; and by giving every man an opportunity of testing and showing his own faith by his works, it made no provision for cases of consciences, nor room for philosophic doubting. But I do not here eulogize it, but only intend to say that it is the only and the all-sufficient means to destroy antichrist, to heal divisions, to unite christians, to convert the world, and to bless all nations; and viewing it in this light, we shall find much use for it in all that we shall attempt in this work.

In detecting the false gospels, nothing will aid us so much as an examination of their tendencies, and a comparison of their effects with what the Millennium proposes. The gospel of no sect can convert the world. This is with us a very plain proposition; and if so, the sectarian gospels are defective, or redundant, or mixed. To one of these general classes belong most of them.

Many topics will demand our attention in this work, as the preceding prospectus indicates. How we shall attend to these and manage them, we can now make no promise—time alone will show. We only claim an impartial and an attentive hearing. We ask for nothing—

not a single concession upon trust. What we cannot evince and demonstrate, we hope all will reject. What we enforce with authority and evidence, we hope that the thoughtful and the devout, the rational and the inquisitive, the candid and the sincere, will espouse and carry into practice. What will not, what cannot, console the unhappy, cheer the disconsolate, confirm the weak, reform the transgressor, purify the ungodly, save the world, and ennoble the human character—we shall rejoice to see repudiated.

I have heard that it is decreed to attempt to destroy this paper as soon as it appears. A correspondent informed me this day that in one city a large subscription had been got up in the way of joint stock to oppose this paper. If they can logically, scripturally, and religiously strangle it in life's porch, or despatch it as his Majesty King Herod despatched the innocents of Bethlehem—I say, let them do it! But I never can believe, upon human testimony, that he can be an impartial judge who has condemned, or erected the scaffold before the victim is tried.

When opposed by the interested, by those whom the corruptions of christianity feed with bread and gratify with honor, I will call to mind the history of all the benefactors of men, and draw both comfort and strength from the remembrance that no man ever achieved any great good to mankind who did not wrest it with violence through ranks of opponents—who did not fight for it with courage and perseverance, and who did not, in the conflict, sacrifice either his good name or his life. John, the harbinger of the Messiah, lost his head. The Apostles were slaughtered. The Saviour was crucified. The ancient confessors were slain. The reformers all have been excommunicated. I know that we shall do little good if we are not persecuted. If I am not traduced, slandered, and misrepresented, I shall be a most unworthy advocate of that cause which has always provoked the resentment of those who have fattened upon the ignorance and superstition of the mass, and have been honored by the stupidity and sottishness of those who cannot think and will not learn. But we have not a few friends and associates in this cause. There are many with whom it shall be my honor to live and labor, and my happiness to suffer and die.

The ancient gospel has many powerful advocates; and the heralds of a better, of a more blissful order of things, social and religious, are neither few nor feeble. No seven years of the last ten centuries, as the last seven, have been so strongly marked with the criteria of the dawn of that period which has been the theme of many a discourse, and the burden of many a prayer.

EDITOR.

## THE CONFIRMATION OF THE TESTIMONY.

ALL revealed religion is based upon facts. Testimony has respect to facts only; and that testimony may be credible, it must be confirmed. These points are of so much importance as to deserve

some illustration, and much consideration. By *facts* we always mean something said or done. The works of God and the words of God, or the things done and spoken by God, are those facts which are laid down and exhibited in the Bible as the foundation of all faith, hope, love, piety, and humanity. All true and useful knowledge is an acquaintance with facts. And all true science is acquired from the observation and comparison of facts. But he that made the heart of man and gave him an intelligent spirit knows that facts alone can move the affections, and command the passions of man. Hence the scheme of mercy which he has discovered to the world, is all contained in, and developed by, *the works of mercy* which he has wrought.

Facts have a meaning which the understanding apprehends and the heart feels. According to the meaning or nature of the fact, is its effect upon us. If a friend have risked his life, or sacrificed his reputation or fortune to relieve us, we cannot but confide in him and love him. If an enemy have attempted our life, invaded our property, or attacked our reputation, we cannot, naturally, but hate him. Nothing but the command of a benefactor, or the will of some dear friend who has laid us under obligation to himself, can prevent us from hating our enemies. If a beloved relative have sustained some great misfortune, we must feel sorry; or if he have been rescued from some impending calamity, we must feel glad. Our joy in the latter case, and our sorrow in the former, arise from the meaning or nature of the fact. The feelings corresponding with the nature of the fact, are excited or called into existence the moment the fact is known or believed. It is *known* when we have witnessed it ourselves, and it is *believed* when reported to us by credible persons who have witnessed it. This is the chief difference between faith and knowledge.

As existences or beings must precede knowledge, so facts must precede either knowledge or belief. An event must happen before it can be known by man—it must be known by some before it can be reported to others—it must be reported before it can be believed, and the testimony must be confirmed, or made credible, before it can be relied on.

Something must be done before it can be known, reported, or believed. Hence, in the order of nature, there is first the fact, then the testimony, and then the belief. A was drowned before B reported it—B reported it before C believed it, and C believed it before he was grieved at it. This is the unchangeable and universal order of things as respects belief. In this example when we reason from effect to cause, it is *grief, belief, testimony, fact*—and from cause to effect, it is *fact, testimony, belief, grief.* We ascend from grief to belief—from belief to testimony—from testimony to fact. We descend from fact to testimony—from testimony to belief—and from belief to grief. To this there is no exception. more than against the universality of the laws of gravity. If, then, there was nothing said or done, there could be no testimony, and so no faith. Religious affections spring from faith; and, therefore, it is of importance that

this subject should be disintricated from the mysticism of the schools.

Laws call for obedience, and testimony for belief. Where there is no law, there can be no obedience; and where there is no testimony, there can be no faith. As obedience cannot transcend law, so faith cannot transcend testimony. John's testimony went to so many facts. On his testimony we can believe only as far as he has testified. And so of all the other witnesses. The certainty of faith depends upon the certainty or credibility of the witnesses. But not so its effects. The *effects* depend upon the facts believed—the *certainty* upon the evidence. I may be equally certain that John was beheaded—that Jesus was crucified.—Nay, I may be as certain of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, as I am of his death on Calvary. The testimony may be equally credible, and the faith equally strong; but the effects produced are not the same. The facts believed have not the same meaning, are not of the same nature, and do not produce the same feelings or effects. I may be as certain of the assassination of Cesar in the Senate House, as I am of the crucifixion of Jesus on Calvary: but as the facts believed are as diverse in the nature, meaning, and bearings upon me as the East and the West; so the effects or fruits of my faith are as different as Julius Cesar and Jesus Christ.

The more ordinary the fact, the more ordinary the testimony necessary to establish it. That A B, aged 90, and confined for some time with sickness, died last night, requires only the most ordinary testimony to render it credible. But that C D lived to 140, enjoying unabated vigor of mind and body, requires stronger testimony. But still all facts happening in accordance with the ordinary and natural laws of things, require but good human testimony to make them worthy of credence. 'Tis only extraordinary and supernatural facts which require supernatural testimony, or testimony supernaturally confirmed. This is the point to which we have been looking in this essay. And now that we have arrived at it, I would ask, *How has the testimony of the Apostles and Evangelists been confirmed?*

To *confirm a testimony* is neither more nor less than to make it credible to those to whom it is tendered; or, to express the same idea in other words, it is to give men power to believe it. Now it will not require the same amount of evidence to persuade an astronomer that the earth's shadow struck the moon last eclipse, as it would to convince an Indian; or it would not require the same amount of evidence to convince a chymist that combustion was effected by pouring water on a certain composition of mineral substances, as it would an unlettered swain. To make any testimony credible to any order of beings, regard must therefore be had to the capacity, attainments, and habits of those beings. To confirm the testimony of the Apostles concerning the Messiah's death, resurrection, ascension into heaven, and coronation as the Lord and King of the Universe, imports no more nor no less than that it should be rendered every way credible to such beings as we are, or that we should be made able to believe it. A testimony *confirmed,* and yet *incredible* to those to whom it is tendered, is a contradiction in terms. But why emphasise on the

word *confirmed?* Because the holy Apostles have emphasised upon it. It is therefore necessary that we should pay a due regard to the confirmation of the testimony. The testimony is one thing, and the confirmation is another. It is necessary, in all important occasions in human affairs, that the testimony which is received between man and man should be confirmed by some sanction. Hence an oath for confirmation of testimony is an end of all strife. The highest confirmation which men require in all questions of fact, is a solemn oath or affirmation that the things affirmed are true.

But supernatural facts require supernatural confirmations. Hence when the confirmation of the gospel is spoken of in the apostolic writings, it is resolved into the doings or works of the Holy Spirit. "*Demonstrations of the Holy Spirit*" are the confirmatory proofs of the gospel. When Paul delivered the testimony of God, or the testimony concerning Jesus, to the Corinthians, he says, "*It was confirmed among them.*" And if we examine into the confirmation of the testimony as Paul explained it, we shall find that he makes the spiritual gifts, or those extraordinary and miraculous powers which the Apostles themselves displayed, and which so many of their converts also possessed, an assurance or confirmation of what he promulged.

We shall only attend to the light which only one of his epistles to the Corinthians throws upon this subject. After thanking his God for the favor bestowed upon the disciples in Corinth when he first visited them, he proceeds to specify the special favors bestowed upon the disciples in that renowned city. "You were enriched (says he, chap. i. ver. 5.) with every gift, by him, even with *all speech* and *all knowledge* when the testimony of Christ was confirmed among you; so that you come behind in *no gift*" "There are diversities of gifts, (says he, chap. xii.) for to one disciple is given *the word of wisdom;* to another, *the word of knowledge;* to another, *faith,* (to be healed;) to another, *the gift of healing;* to another, *the ability of working in others the power of working miracles;* to another, *prophecy;* to another, *discerning of spirits;* to another, *diverse kinds of foreign tongues;* and to another, *the interpretation of foreign tongues.*"— Now the Corinthians were put in possession of these (for they came behind in no gift) "when the testimony of Christ was confirmed among them." For, says Paul, I came not to you with the excellency of speech, or the persuasive eloquence of the schools, but with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your belief of my testimony, or your faith, might not rest, or be founded, upon human wisdom or eloquence, but upon the power of God evinced in the demonstrations of the Spirit which confirmed my testimony among you. For had it not been for these demonstrations of the Spirit and of power, your faith could not have rested upon an immoveable basis.

To those desirous to understand this subject, an examination of this first letter to the Corinthians cannot fail to be most instructive; for it most clearly and unequivocally teaches us that the *visible, audible, sensible* demonstration of the Spirit and of power was that supernatural attestation of the testimony of Christ which made it credible, so

that no man could have acknowledged Jesus of Nazareth to be the Almighty Lord but by this demonstration of the Holy Spirit. Thus was the testimony confirmed—thus was Jesus demonstrated to be the only begotten Son of God—and thus, and thus only, are men enabled to believe in him.

Some mystics in ancient times, and some of the moderns yet affirm, that the infusion of the Holy Spirit into the hearts of disciples as the *spirit of adoption*—as the *Spirit of Christ*—is that *demonstration of the Spirit* which enables men to believe. But this is as unreasonable as it is unscriptural: *unreasonable* because no such inspiration, no invisible, inaudible, or insensible operation or effect can be called a *demonstration of the Spirit* on which faith rests—none of the terms used by the Apostle can bear such an exposition. And it is *unscriptural*, for none of the converts to christianity in the New Testament are represented as converted but by *what they saw and heard;* and the Spirit of Holiness was a gift promised to them, and to them only who believe.

A *demonstration* that cannot be seen or heard, is, in our mother tongue, no demonstration at all: and a faith that rests upon any thing called demonstrations of the Spirit and of power which are only felt in the heart, is a faith resting upon itself. The testimony and the confirmation must be alike extrinsic, else it is no confirmation at all. No *feeling* in the heart can be called a *demonstration.* The eye or the ear, and strictly the former, but figuratively the latter, are the senses to which demonstrations are submitted. None but mystics could draw a demonstration in confirmation of a fact or a testimony from the effect produced in the heart. What would a person of common sense say to a mother who labored to prove that the tidings she had heard of the death of her only son were true, because she felt sorry to hear and believe them? In vain would she call her grief, her agony, her tears, a demonstration that the testimony was true. These might be proofs that she believed the tidings, but never can they prove the tidings to be true. But why labor to tediousness in support of that which is almost self-evident?

But it is not only in the Epistle to the Corinthians that notice is taken of the confirmation of the testimony. John Mark informs us that Jesus commanded the original witnesses to proclaim to every creature the glad tidings, with this assurance, that all who heard them, believed them, and were immersed, should be saved; and all that heard them, and disbelieved them, should be damned. But, adds the historian, (chap. xvi. ver. 20.) "They went out and proclaimed the tidings every where, the Lord co-operating with them and *confirming* their testimony, or teaching, *by the miracles wherewith it was accompanied.*" And to the same effect writes the Apostle to the Hebrews, (chap. ii. 5.) "This great salvation which, beginning to be spoken by the Lord, was *confirmed* to us by them that heard him." How?—"God bearing joint testimony, both by signs and wonders, and diverse miracles and distributions of the Holy Spirit, according to his own pleasure." Such, then, was the confirmation of the testimony, and such

confirmation, or demonstration of the Holy Spirit, enabled all men, who attended to it with an honest heart, to believe.

The narrative of the labors and success of the Apostles, which Luke gives, corroborates, by the examples it adduces, the above statements. Take Peter's labors for example. His testimony on Pentecost was confirmed by a sound from heaven, by tongues of fire; and when they heard his testimony, and saw the signs accompanying it, thousands believed the testimony. When they saw him cure the cripple, and heard him announce the glad tidings at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, multitudes believed. When he cured Eneas, the paralytic of Lydda, "all the inhabitants of Lydda and Saron *saw him and turned to the Lord.*" When he raised to life again Tabitha of Joppa, "this was known throughout all Joppa, and many believed in the Lord." Such was the order of that day. And thus was the testimony confirmed, and men and women enabled to believe.

From all that has been said, the following conclusions are apparent, and of much practical importance, at least to all who labor in the word and teaching:—

1. The testimony which God has given, or the testimony which the Apostles gave concerning Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God, and the all-sufficient Saviour of the World, is a *credible* testimony, a well-confirmed testimony; and as confirmed by the demonstrations of the Spirit and power of God, *worthy of all acceptation;* and by it men, *otherwise without strength,* are made able to believe. Hence all who wait for the testimony to be specially confirmed to them, wait for what they have no promise nor right to receive, and which God cannot bestow without implying that the testimony is otherwise unworthy of belief; or, what we commonly call incredible.

2. Every one who says he cannot believe, says that the testimony is incredible; that God has not confirmed it; and in so doing expressly contradicts the Apostle, who says, "The report is credible, or true, and worthy of all reception; that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners;" or else he means, that he *will not* believe, and therefore will not hear the testimony lest he should believe it. He that believeth not, makes God a liar, because he says that his testimony is not true.

3. The ancients were enabled to call *Jesus* Lord of All, the King Eternal, Immortal, and Invisible, from the demonstrations of the Hol Spirit confirming the testimony, without any other aid than the power of God exhibited in attestation of the testimony. So are we when the testimony is fairly and ably laid before us. Hence in producing faith in the minds of men, all that is necessary is, to do justice to the whole testimony of God—to do what Paul said, he did, without the persuasive words of human philosophy, declare the testimony of God.—Hence all men who believe and preach Christ, should be able to give a reason of the hope which they entertain, by adducing the evidences of the gospel—not by telling their experience, which will never convince any body but an enthusiast; any more than Mary's testimony concerning her grief will be a demonstration that the report of her son's

death is true. Peter never commanded any man to narrate his own feelings as a reason of the hope which he had in the Messiah, in preference to, or in competition with, the confirmed testimony. No, the best reason of faith is a well authenticated testimony, or confirmed evidences. Our experience may be a consolation to ourselves, as our behavior will be a corroboration to others; but the demonstrations which the Spirit has afforded alone can enable any man to say that Jesus is the Lord.

4. As the first christians were convinced by the Holy Spirit and enabled to believe by the attestations which he gave; so, after they believed and obeyed the gospel, they had the Holy Spirit infused into their hearts; and were then, because they were sons—(for to as many as received him to them he gave power to become the sons of God,) enabled by the spirit imparted to them to say, *Our Father*—so will it be with them who now believe and obey the same gospel upon the same evidences and for the same reasons.

5. As Jesus, when on earth, finished the work of redemption, but in heaven he is our High Priest; so the Holy Spirit on earth, after his ascension, finished the confirmation of the testimony: but now, in addition to that work which makes redemption *credible*, he sheds his influences in the hearts of them who obey. If any man can make himself happy, from any supposed change of heart, before he has obeyed the gospel, he deludes himself. 'Tis only by obeying the truth that any man can be sanctified and comforted by it. The story told by some of their happiness before obedience, is to me as wild and incredible as the story of the Phenix clapping its wings over dried sticks until it sets them on fire. If, then, all who undertake to preach Christ, would, instead of preaching their own dreams, or even their *real* experiences, exhibit the evidences; and instead of telling men to wait or pray for good signs, or for power to believe, persuade them to *obey the gospel*, the gospel would run and be glorified, and sectarianism would wither as the grass. To effect this is the leading object of this paper; and if it fail to produce this conviction in any attentive reader, if he will furnish me with his objections I will do them justice. EDITOR.

## THE VANTAGE GROUND,

### *Illustrated in Messrs. Randolf Stone, Samuel Rogers, Joshua Wilson, Samuel Davis, Andrew Fuller, &c.*

BEING REVIEWS OF NOTICES, A CIRCULAR LETTER, &c.

THE advocates of popular errors stand on the vantage ground against those who advocate unpopular truths. Having got the public ear accustomed to their song, their music has no discord in it. The consciences of the people formed to their hands, and their modes of reasoning established to their wish, it is easy to retain their understandings and their consciences in their service. Thus a Christian has a poor chance with a Turk, and a Protestant in a Catholic country

The most logical inductions and correct reasonings of an intelligent Christian against a Turk, can be converted into pure sophistry by the magic of "*the Prophet's*" name, or the ignominy in the epithet "*You Christian Dog!*" A Protestant in Spain would employ all the logic and rhetoric of the most finished scholar to no purpose against the arguments of the Inquisition, and the bells, pomegranates, relics, and holy water of the priesthood.

In Protestant countries there is the magic of names, usages, and early associations, against which logic is impotent, and reason unavailing. In New England and Virginia, some fifty or sixty years ago, Methodists, Quakers, and Baptists, went over to Satan by the magic of the surplice and the *decency* of a good and grave divine. His gown and his wig, if he had one, either powdered or grey—his rite of confirmation, or his holy unction, solemnized every thing; and a single frown of a graceful eyebrow, or a curl of a well turned lip, established the truth and made error doubly condemnable. A Baptist with a Puritan, and a Methodist with a curate, had as much chance of triumph in argument, as a slave has of becoming a scholar in Georgia. But times have changed; and all that is necessary to make error *truth* with a great majority, is, to let it gain the ascendant. The majority constitutes, with many, the infallible standard of truth. Some, and not a few, judge of every thing by its success. Hence Bacon of Virginia was a rebel, and Washington a hero and a patriot. The scheme that triumphs is too generally consecrated; and the world and society, as hitherto constituted, are an easy prey to aspiring demagogues. Until education is more generally diffused, both in church and state, the led will be many, and the leaders few.

But to the vantage ground again. To refute the whole Baptist system was the easiest thing imaginable, while a Parson had 15,000 *lbs. of tobacco* per annum, and a Puritan had the *blue laws* to aid him. To call christian immersion, "plunging a person over head and ears in a pond;" to speak of the "efficacy of much or little water" with a sneer; to call it "an *indecent* thing," made it infamous in the esteem of polite ladies and gallant gentlemen. And as for these "roaring, ranting, raving Methodists, with their works of merit and their no-grace-scheme," it was the easiest thing for a decent and fashionable moralist to send them all to to perdition by giving them these epithets. And now some of these self-same Methodists can denounce their reforming brethren by the very same arguments and logic which were showered on their own heads, like frogs on Egypt. The Baptists, too, have got their fashionable and popular standards—their Gill, their Fuller, and their Booth—their creeds and advisory councils—their schools, their colleges, and their Gamaliels too—and by the magic of these *marks of the beast* they claim homage and respect, and dispute the high places with those very Rabbis whose fathers were wont to grin at *their* fathers. Thus while one set of tables has been turned, and one pack of money-changers has been whipped out of the temple, another race and generation have seized their places.

Now, in the self-same spirit, and with more talent, have some in all

parties persecuted and sneered at the *ancient gospel* and *ancient order of things*. Primitive christianity has become as odious in the esteem of many of our Gamaliels as it was in the days of their great ancestors —as it was to the respectable and right reverend Caiphas, D. D.—the Rev. Annas, D. D.—the Rev. Messrs. "John and Alexander, and as many as are of the high priest's kindred."*

---

## MR. RANDOLPH STONE AND HIS WESTERN INTELLIGENCER."

A CERTAIN Mr. Randolph Stone, who edits a "Western Intelligencer, *literary, religious, and political*," in Hudson, Portage county, Ohio, of which "*Intelligencer*" I have seen one sheet, of the 15th December, 1829, has written two or three columns on the Prospectus of this work. Whether this worthy brother of the type be a political magician I know not; but he is "a freshman," at least, in the cabalistic school, and seems to find himself on the vantage ground. He knows the magical import of such phrases as the following: "The *received* doctrines of christianity," "the *benevolent* institutions of the day," "*christian* enterprizes which throw so much lustre on this age," "such men as Edwards, Dwight, Davis, Owen, Newton, Scott, and Chalmers." This is his logic; and his rhetoric is, "Mr. Campbell is chuckling behind the scene to see what fools he has made;" "proclaiming the ancient gospel and the ancient order of things!" which phrases, with his notes of contempt, he repeats *twelve* or *thirteen times!* And to finish his climax, he says that the Editor of the *Harbinger* [myself] "will call to his aid the various infidel clubs in New York and Philadelphia as principal contributors." Such are the means to be used by the lovers of the modern gospels, and the present order of things. After many such fine rhetorical touches, as he thought, this champion of orthodoxy represents me as some poor mercenary like himself, who will write whatever will sell, true or false, for a piece of bread and butter. This is about as reasonable an inference from my whole course, from all my history, as the following sentence is true: "Mr. Campbell's proselytes have become considerable numerous, and go from place to place, exploding the old-fashioned way of commencing and continuing a christian life, by faith and repentance, and a godly conversation, and substituting for it their newly discovered way, which is simply to be *baptized*." Whom he calls my proselytes I cannot say; but one thing I do say, that I will disown, not only as as a *proselyte*, but as a *brother*, every man, profess what he may, who will detach *baptism* from faith, repentance, and a godly behavior. Nor would I rank among the decent, well bred, or courteous citizens of this world, any person who could be guilty of such outrageous calumny and detraction, as this chevalier of orthodoxy.

But as I have always, as a writer, given a fair sample of all that has been written or said against myself, my sentiments, and course, I thought it due to the public, though it appears to me almost a pollution

**Acts iv. 4.*

of any page to inscribe upon it such flagitious abuse of speech and of the liberty of the press—I say, I thought it due to the public to instance the case of Mr. Stone in illustration of the course adopted by such as occupy the vantage ground. These gentry are happily exempted from all use, or rather necessity, for any use of reason or argument. If they only cry loud and long, "*This is the image which fell down from Jupiter!*" whom, as Mr. Stone says, "all Asia and the world worship;" or, as he chooses to express it, "the RECEIVED doctrines of christianity." Yes, "all Asia and the world worship!" These gentry, though living a few thousand miles, and some two thousand years apart, remarkably fraternize in their mode of defending their respective systems. "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" was the text and is the text. Not so candid, however, are the moderns as the ancients. For they said, "Fellow-craftsmen, you know that by this craft (manufacture) our maintenance arises." But the moderns, some of them at least, will be the first to impute mercenary motives to them who are successfully shearing them of their power, merely to obtain for themselves the appearance of disinterestedness; when all who know them can perceive and know full well that their only VISIBLE *primum mobile* is a slice off the popular loaf. Paul said there were some *christians* in his time whose god was their own stomachs; and these *hungry* christians were wont to accuse Paul and Titus of making a *gain* of them, although by *his own hands*, in many instances, he had ministered to his own wants and to his fellow-travellers. I intend not to apply this to the "*Western Intelligencer*," for I know nothing of the man, save the painting he has given of himself; and if he has done justice to the original, he is certainly not among the most lovely of modern christians. I should not have introduced his name here had he not called upon me to look at him; and even then, I would not have looked off from my purpose, but by the association of ideas I found in him an illustration of that class of belligerents who think they stand upon so lofty an eminence, and have so strong a fortress around them, that a laugh, or a sneer, or a witticism, or a calumny from them, will put to flight a whole phalanx of arguments, reasons, and proofs. Yes, to say that this is the "*received* doctrine of christianity" is sufficient proof that it is true; and to call any thing else *novel*, or to nickname it *heresy*, is all-sufficient to constitute it error, and to doom it to absolute renunciation by those who stand upon the vantage ground.

---

## EBENEZER ROGER's AND Dr. WILSON's MOUNT PLEASANT (MISSOURI) CIRCULAR,

EXAMINED AS COMING FROM THE VANTAGE GHOUND; AND ANDREW FULLER'S REGENERATED UNBELIEVER—WITH STRICTURES ON TEXT-PREACHING.

A Mr. ROGERS, of Missouri, is another of these vantage ground christians. I had occasion not long since to give him a few words in passing. He wrote the libellous and slanderous letter of the Mount

Pleasant Association, in Missouri, for the last year. He is, for one of the freshmen, in the magic of epithets, very dexterous. He imputes to me the heresy of Sandeman, and with all the terrific attributes with which that heresiarch is clothed, he assails me. Then, after having, as he thinks, much to my mortification, given to Sandeman and Glass the glory of my views, he proceeds to prove his positions. Now when I quote a text to prove or illustrate any point, I find myself bound to show that I apply it correctly—that I give it the precise application of the writer; but if I occupied the vantage ground it would be enough to quote it under the authority of some great name. Thus Mr. Rogers quotes and applies many texts just as Mr. Fuller quotes them, and other writers, who address their audiences as *dead* men. He affords to my mind indubitable proofs of as servile a spirit of quoting as ever did any of the implicit followers of the hierarchy of Rome. He is either thus enslaved, or he thinks, claiming the vantage ground, that it will all pass current without examination, because he supports the popular side. Now I hold it to be just as possible to teach error by quoting scripture, as it is without opening the Bible; nay, I believe the most successful errorists are those who interlard their writings almost line about with scripture phrases. Some of the most dangerous books I have ever read, so called by popular Baptists and Presbyterians, were those almost half scripture. In the few sentences which the Devil employed to seduce the Messiah there are found *three texts* of scripture, very adroitly and plausibly brought in.

The popular system-mongers, feeling themselves strong in the heads and hearts of their admirers, feel no need to show that they apply scripture correctly. Now we, who have to fight every inch of our way, sword in hand, feel ourselves bound to quote the scriptures in their own context and fixed meaning, and this requires more labor than is necessary to maintain the whole doctrine of any popular sect. I once quoted the scriptures in this random way, and I know from experience the bad effects of it. It is owing to this lax and latitudinarian spirit of quoting, that Episcopalians have so much trouble with the Catholics; that Presbyterians have so much labor with Episcopalians, and that Baptists have so much trouble with Paidobaptists in their respective wrestlings with each other for authority for their respective peculiarities.

When the ecclesiastic belligerents are nearly equal in popular esteem, they pay more attention to the rules of interpretation; but when the one party sits in Moses' seat and the other is proscribed, the *sound* of a verse coming from the chair is better than the *meaning* often coming from the floor. As I have recently heard that some Doctors of Presbyterianism, especially the good Doctor of Cincinnati, the Rev. Joshua Wilson, D. D. have highly eulogized this same Circular, and some of the would-be Rabbis of the Presbyterian Baptists, I feel it my duty to bestow a few more strictures upon it.

When in Richmond, a few weeks ago, I gave it a hasty perusal, and made full as many remarks upon it as I then thought, and now think, it deserves. But if my opponents think it deserves more, for

their sakes I will bestow a few more upon it. Not for their sakes either, for they are not to be convinced; but because they give it such an importance, and make so much use of it, I will attempt to show how drowning men catch at straws.

If Mr. Rogers had only made an effort to sustain himself by supporting his own dogmas, I should not have formed so unfavorable an opinion of him, as I am constrained to do, from his *unrighteous* attempt to fasten upon me a system which he must have known, if he has read the *Christian Baptist* with ordinary attention, I most unequivocally disclaim. He is much more of a *Sandemanian* than I am, as I can prove, if I have not already done it.

That I agree with almost all sects in something, Catholic and Protestant; and with all men, savage and civilized, I do not hesitate to say; but to call me a savage, a Catholic, or a Sandemanian, for so doing, I must consider an outrage upon christian and courteous decorum.

If I may be allowed to express my own convictions, I agree with the whole system of Andrew Fuller more than I agree with the whole system of Robert Sandeman; and yet I think I can show to the dullest apprehension that both are *fundamentally* wrong in some very important items. I have done this already in Sandeman's case; and, if the Lord will, I shall attempt it in the case of Andrew Fuller. But names apart, either popular or unpopular, I proceed to examine the leading points in this eulogized Circular.

This zealous champion of Fullerism neither understands the scriptures nor the Christian Baptist. I presume, however, he is only a second-hand student of them, and is content with understanding only "the *essential* doctrines." This appears as manifest to me as it would be when hearing a man quote Horace fluently from a dictionary of quotations, that he never studied that author. I have met with some great quoters of the Roman poets who never read one of them through. In the first paragraph of this letter there are *three* misapplications of christian scriptures. After infusing into an unbeliever Mr. Fuller's "*holy desire*" and "*suitable disposition*," he starts to prove that all unbelievers must have this infused by some mysterious agency to enable them to believe. Now if an *unbeliever* can have a *holy* and a *suitable disposition* towards God, I know not of what use faith can be to him. Then Mr. Fuller's *holy unbeliever*, or his *regenerated infidel*, is to be proved from scripture. And, courteous reader, what is the proof? Mr. Rogers quotes five words from Acts xvii. 2. He marks these words thus: "Thus 'the Bereans sought and found,' Acts xvii. 2." This is *literatim et punctuatim* as it stands in the Circular before me. Now I cannot think that Mr. Rogers intended here to practise a *holy legerdemain*, though he has done it; for there are no such words in all the New Testament, ancient or modern versions. It is a line from some hymn he has quoted, and to this line he appended "Acts xvii. 2." supposing it to be scripture. Dr. Wilson, as erudite in the scriptures as his brother Rogers, sanctions the error by having

some hundreds of the Circular distributed, if not printed, by his authority. However a line of a hymn may pass for scripture with Dr. Wilson and Mr. Rogers, it will not pass with me as *proof as strong as holy writ.*

In the common version, Acts xvii. 10, 11, 12, it is thus written: "And the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea: who coming thither went into the synagogue of the Jews. These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily whether these things were so. Therefore, many of them believed; also of honorable women which were Greeks and of men not a few." If this was the passage pretended to be cited as proof, courteous reader, mark the violence offered to it. The general character of the Bereans, Luke says, was "*more noble*"—"their disposition was more generous" (Doddridge) than those of Thessalonica. Now this trait of character which distinguished the Bereans from the Thessalonians, is, when put into the distillery of Messrs. Fuller, Rogers, and Wilson, converted into a "*holy desire*" and a "*suitable disposition*" wrought in the heart by some mysterious agency, to enable them to believe the word proclaimed by Paul!!! Yet their faith is described as the result of their "*searching the scriptures daily.*" This religious *hocus pocus*, or legerdemain, is the crying sin of this age.

Here, for the first time for many years, I brushed the dust off a volume containing Mr. Fuller's views of a holy disposition infused into the soul previous to faith. I have glanced over a few pages of it; and, to my no little astonishment, he argues stoutly that a man is regenerated by the Holy Spirit *before he believes;* that faith is the *effect* of regeneration. I thought he must say something of the Bereans, as I discover Mr. Rogers follows him *pari passu*, though with shorter steps. I soon found the Bereans adduced as in the Circular. But Mr. Fuller quotes the passage fairly, and felt the difficulty which I thought would entangle any man of sense. The difficulty was this: If the Bereans were regenerated before they believed, and had died while searching the scriptures before they believed, would they have been considered as unbelievers? Mr. Fuller says, (page 214) "Had they died while in this noble pursuit, they would not have been treated as unbelievers. So a regenerated unbeliever was conceivable to Mr. Fuller. But Luke says, only *many* of these noble-minded Bereans believed. Now if *noble-minded* is equivalent to regenerated in reference to some, it must be so in reference to all of those to whom it is applied. Only, then, some of those regenerated Bereans believed!!!

The word, or gospel, is not the instrument of regeneration, for men must be regenerated before they believe; nay, Mr. Fuller, in his mystic theology, argues that both repentance and regeneration must precede faith. So much for theological metaphysics. Men must be sorry for their sins before they believe in God against whom they have sinned, and have holy desires for an unknown object! This is as reasonable as that Mr. Rogers can love a person, or have ardent desires

for the society of a person in Asia, of whom he is perfectly ignorant; and that he can repent of sins committed against a being of whose existence he has neither knowledge nor belief!!

But it is not with the unreasonableness of the view that I have to do—it is with its antiscriptural character. It is in positive contradiction of one of the plainest passages of scripture, which saith, "Of his own will begat he us *by the word of truth;*" and of another, which saith, "We are born again by, or through, the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

His next quotation is as follows: "Let us beware of calling any man Master—one is our Master, even Christ;" "Search the scriptures;" "It is his command." This is all good counsel, but a misapplication of the words quoted. Scripture can be misapplied when quoted to prove what is true, as well as in proving what is false. Jesus Christ never commanded us to search the New Testament scriptures, for they were not then written; nor did he command the Jews in this passage to search the Jewish scriptures. Mr. Rogers may be excused here because he takes the common version without examination. Dr. Wilson ought, and Mr. Rogers might, have known better. The connexion will not authorise the imperative mood. The argument is this: "You Jews do search the scriptures because you believe them to contain eternal life. Now these scriptures testify of me; yet you will not come to me for that life which they reveal." [*See the New Version.*]

The third quotation is thus introduced: "We have his promise to assist our humble inquiries." "They shall be all taught of God. John vi. 45." Now the question is, Was this promise given to those persons to whom Jesus addressed himself, John v. 39? No, for the persons addressed in John v. 39. were in Jerusalem, and those addressed in John vi. 45. were in Capernaum. But again, John vi. 45. contains a quotation from Isaiah which was not applied as a promise to any persons *searching the scriptures*, but a general truth concerning all those who received Jesus! It is a general truth not confined to those who search the scriptures, but to all who receive the Messiah.

Now what labor would it impose on me, and how much patience would it require of the reader, were I to examine some forty or fifty quotations in this way. I have taken the three first citations from the New Testament as a specimen. And I appeal to any unprejudiced, good common sense, plain scholar, who will read these passages in the New Testament, whether Mr. Rogers has not perverted and misapplied the whole three, honestly disposed no doubt, but blinded by a mystical system. He may talk for ages about his supernatural teaching: but if the Spirit has taught him a meaning of scripture contrary to its most manifest literal import, of what use is it to read it at all!! It is no wonder we have so many infidels in the world. But Mr. Rogers, either at his own hand or at second hand, has been vitiated by *Fullerism*. And if I do not, when opportunity serves, show that the whole of this metaphysical theology of Fuller's "previous holy disposition" is founded on the most gross perversions of scripture, then

there is no light in me. I will undertake this ere long; for in my last tour through Virginia, I discover that some of our old and young teachers are perverted by Fuller, either directly or indirectly.

But to return to the Circular. I cannot consent, how useful soever it may be, to expose all the misapplication of scripture in this letter of 12 pages. This would be to write a volume. But I must expose it still more fully.

He next takes Samuel Davis for his guide, and gives us a liberal quotation from Samuel, (not the Prophet.) This Samuel Davis was another perverter of scripture, if friend Rogers has done him justice. He quotes and paraphrases Paul thus: "A zealous Paul may plant the word, and an eloquent Apollos may water it." Now, gentle reader, turn over to the first letter to the Corinthians, and see whether Paul talked of planting the word and Apollos watering the word! and ask what was the *water* which Apollos poured on the word!!! Paul may plant churches and Apollos may water churches I can understand; but how Apollos was to *water the word* requires one of these mystic Doctors to explain. I shall not attempt it.

He next, after a few sallies into Buck's Theological Dictionary, begins to quote the Christian Baptist with the same disregard to connexion he had showed to the Apostles. And here he cannot plead a *special* illumination; for I know my own meaning at least better than he can. He asks me if I am sure that the quickening influence of the Holy Spirit is nothing more than a *metaphysical whim?* I never said so, Mr. Rogers. Your conceits I call *metaphysical whims;* but not the quickening influence of the Holy Spirit. If such quotations and applications shall be made of the words of a living author, alas! for the dead! We shall now let him speak for himself in one of his most luminous flights:—

"When the grand question concerning faith comes to be discussed (says Mr. C.) there can be but one faith, and that is the belief of history or the belief of testimony oral or written. For example, A tells me that the ice on the Ohio river is strong enough to sustain my weight on the back of my horse, I believe his testimony and hazard my horse and person on the ice." C. B. January 5th, 1829, p. 135. As the above is a peculiar illustration of faith in Jesus Christ, we shall carry the subject a little farther. We will suppose Mr. Campbell and his friend Philip to be on the bank of the Ohio at Newport (Kentucky) opposite Cincinnati, in the depth of winter. M. C. tells his friend P. that the ice on the Ohio is strong enough to sustain his weight on the back of his horse, and that he is particularly anxious that he should go over to Cincinnati, for your going will terminate to your advantage (continued Mr. C;) there are treasures of immense value which shall be yours if you only cross the river, and more than that, a feast of the most delicious delicacies is prepared for you at the Inn; yea, a feast of fat things and well refined wine. From the powerful evidence, says Philip, you have advanced relative to the strength of the ice—the immense value of the treasures—the deliciousness

of the provisions prepared, I feel myself bound to give the full assent of my understanding to what you have testified. I believe all you have said. And says P. I find that I have physical power to cross the river, that is, my body and limbs are sufficiently strong. But friend C. I must acknowledge the truth; I have no inclination—no desire to be at Cincinnati; nay, I have an utter aversion to, and an inveterate hatred against the place and all its inhabitants; and as for the treasures you mention, I have no heart for them. With regard to the feast and provisions you have been recommending, my very soul loathes and abhors the whole. But continues P. I have Idols at Lexington, I have loved them, and after them I WILL go. My whole heart is with them. He now turns his course towards Lexington, the direct opposite of Cincinnati, and follows the foolish bent of his inclination, as all unrenewed souls do, until convinced of their error by divine grace."

Now the question is, What meaneth all this? It is intended to show that an aversion may exist against the truth after it is believed; that a man may believe the gospel; acknowledge with his *head* or his *heart* that it is all true; be assured that God is as good, kind, loving, compassionate, and merciful, as it represents him to be; that Jesus died for his sins, and rose again for his justification, and has promised eternal happiness to all who obey him, and yet have no relish nor love for it. If this be his meaning, and if it have any relevancy, such must be his meaning; then I say such a case never did, and never can exist. That men who do not believe the gospel may have such an aversion, I doubt not; but he can produce no instance in holy writ, nor out of it, of a case in point to his imaginative case. But supposing an unbeliever to have such an aversion, and this is quite supposable, then he would teach him that the Holy Spirit must *without*, and *previous to his faith*—nay, *without the word*, slay his aversion as physically as he created something out of nothing. And such a promise is not to be found in all the Bible, nor can he adduce such a case authenticated by any inspired author. I can form no idea of overcoming the enmity of the human heart by a display of love, and it is by speaking of *Christ*, and not of *himself*, that the Holy Spirit convinces the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment. Messrs. Wilson, Rogers, & Co. may cease to preach the gospel of the Holy Spirit, for the Saviour said the Spirit shall speak not of himself, nor his own doings, "but of me." It is perfect mysticism which they preach—a mere fable; and no Apostle either furnishes them with precept or precedent. Andrew Fuller may do it. And if they prefer him as a guide, before Paul, they may follow him. But, for my part, I will not—I dare not—I cannot. I prefer the *ancient* to *Andrew Fuller's* gospel.

The more men preach the Spirit the less they feel of it, if I may judge from all that is visible and manifest. These preachers of the modern gospel of mystic influences, exhibit more rancorous spirits, more pride, insolence, and covetousness—in one word, more of the

spirit of this world, than any other class of preachers with which I am acquainted. This I say from woful experience. Some of the most ungodly preachers I ever knew, and certainly some of the most uncivilized, impolite, barbarous, and persecuting spirits of my acquaintance, are these declaimers upon mystic operations. There are no men whose tongues I fear more than those preachers of physical regeneration. I could name a host of them: but I wish, if they cannot be converted, to let them die with the age in which they live. Paul and John gave immortality to a sufficient number of the class.

But to my friend Mr. Rogers, of whom I may, perhaps, hope better things, though I thus speak. After this case, which he no doubt supposed was a very apposite one, he proceeds to lay down two propositions which he says are maintained throughout the whole of Divine Revelation: "1. Whatever is good or holy in man is of God, and HE deserves the praise of it. 2. Whatever is wicked or evil in the human family, is of themselves, and to them belong the blame of it." These are his fundamentals. Now I most unequivocally agree with the first; and if he had not totally excluded the Devil from the second, I would have declared myself unequivocally well pleased with it. I am willing to allow the Devil some agency in the subject of the second position, as he gives to God the sole agency in the first. With this exception we agree with him in these two propositions. Agreeing with him, then, in these two cardinal points, it is unnecessary to examine his proofs. I would not notice one of them were it not for other purposes. For, strange as it may seem, I do not think the scriptures he has brought prove his points. I am assured that his positions are true, and equally certain that he has not proved them. If he thought that I disagreed with him in his two capital points, he is as ignorant of my views as he appears to be of the general meaning of scripture. But I cannot do justice to him at this time, and shall postpone further remarks till my next. I hope the examination of his letter will save me the trouble, and my readers the toil of examining any other production of a similar character for some time. I consider this letter of Mr. Rogers not now as I did before—the work of an individual. Two Doctors of Divinity, as I am told, (*Dr. Noel* and *Dr. Wilson*,) have become godfathers for it. We shall, then, consider it as their foster child.

But, christian reader, when I have disproved their theory, think not that any other good will result to you from the refutation of it, than that it exposes to you one cause of sectarianism—one great means why the gospel is of so little effect; and it removes one obstacle out of the way of a plain and forcible declaration of the testimony of God to the world: but were you to proclaim to men, or to cherish in your own bosom, any contrary theory, however true, it would neither make you a more successful champion of the faith, nor a more happy christian. For the adoption of any theory is not the adoption of christianity; and the preaching of any theory is not the preaching of the gospel.

EDITOR.

## MESSRS. CONVERSE AND CLOPTON.

HEROD and Pontius Pilate once agreed, but it was in persecuting the Prince of Peace. So those who once traduced one another as holding dangerous and soul-ruining errors, now unite in crying out, "Dangerous errors!" "Ruinous errors!" "Damnable heresies!" against the Editor of the *Christian Baptist*. Hence it cometh to pass that the Rev. *A. Converse* of the Paidobaptist army, and the Rev. *A. W. Clopton* of the Baptist army, both unite in persecuting me with all the bitterness, wrath, and evil speaking, of the most crusading of the Jesuitical spirits of the epoch of the Inquisition. Yet these are the men who talk of the want of a christian spirit in others!! But, reader, examine for yourself. I will introduce them to your acquaintance in their own persons:—

*From the Southern* [*Richmond*] *Religious Telegraph, of January* 30.

### "MR. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

*"Extract of a letter from the Rev. Abner W. Clopton, to a clergyman in this city, dated Charlotte Court-House, January* 20, 1830.

["No comment on this letter appears necessary. The views here presented respecting Mr. Campbell's system correspond with those which we have recently expressed. To warn the public against the dangerous errors of this system, will not be deemed a work of supererogation by those who understand it, and the consequences connected with its propagation in any part of the church of Christ."—*Ed.*]

"It appears to me peculiarly important, at the present period, while that which I consider ruinous error, is coming into the churches like a flood, that all evangelical ministers should aim to draw the cords of brotherly love more closely, and "*strengthen the things that remain.*" I think I am warranted in the belief that the *religious* sentiments of Alexander Campbell are exerting already a most deadly influence on the peace and prosperity of the Baptist churches—and are calculated, most eminently, to injure the cause of vital godliness, wheresoever the *little* work, *called* the Christian Baptist, is read and *believed*.

"And although we rejoice in the persuasion, that "the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his;" yet I should think it to be as much the duty of the under shepherds of Christ to guard the flock against damnable heresies, *privily* brought in, as to "feed the church which he has purchased with his own blood." As regards the course pursued by Mr. Campbell, I should judge, that now his sentiments are fully developed—*the die is cast*—Cesar has crossed the Rubicon. He, no doubt, is conscious of this—and no matter who fails—no matter how much dissension—no matter if every branch of vital piety should wither by his magic touch—his object is before him. This he will pursue.

"Under circumstances like these, is there not a loud call for fasting and prayer in our churches? and should not every sentinel whom Christ hath chosen, awake, and girding on the gospel armor of faith, and hope, and love, contend earnestly for *the faith* once delivered to the saints?"

These men talk of fasting and prayer!! What hypocrisy! Let us hear how one of Mr. Converse' loving brethren fasted and prayed over Mr. Clopton's brethren. Yes, the pious Paidobaptist *Richard Baxter* thus accused Mr. Clopton in the person of his brethren—in the loins of his ancestors. The soul-ruining and murdering Baptists destroy both soul and body by plunging men and women into water. But hear Richard Baxter:—

"My sixth argument," says he, "shall be against the usual manner of their baptizing, as it is by dipping over head in a river, or other cold water. That which is a plain breach of the 6th commandment, "*Thou shalt not kill*," is no ordinance of God, but a heinous sin. And as Mr. Cradock shows, in his book of Gospel Liberty, the magistrate ought to *restrain* it to save the lives of his subjects. That this is a *flat murder*, and no better, being ordinarily and generally used, is undeniable to any understanding man. And I know not what trick a covetous landlord can find out to get his tenants to die apace, that he may have new fees and heriots, likelier than to encourage such preachers, that he may get them all to turn Anabaptist. I wish that *this device* be not it which countenanceth such men; and covetous physicians, methinks, should not be much against them; catarrhs and obstructions, which are the two great fountains of most mortal diseases in man's body, could scarce have a more notable means to produce them, where they are not, or to increase them where they are. Apoplexies, lethargies, palsies, and all other comatous diseases, would be promoted by it. So would cephalgies, hemicranies, phthisics, debility of the stomach, crudities, and almost all fevers, dysenteries, diarrhœas, cholics, illiac passions, convulsions, spasms, and so on. All hepatic, splenetic, and pulmonic persons, and hypochondriacs, would soon have enough of it. In a word, it is good for nothing but to despatch men out of the world, that are burdensome, and to ranken church yards. I conclude, if murder be a sin, then dipping ordinarily over head in England is a sin; and if those who would make it men's religion to murder themselves, and urge it upon their consciences as a duty, *are not to be suffered as a commonwealth*, any more than highway murderers, then judge how these Anabaptists, that teach the necessity of such dipping, are to be suffered." *Baxter's Plain Scripture Proof, p.* 124.

How loving are the sons of these men, and how charitable to each other in supporting Diana of the Ephesians! While they accuse one another of "damnable heresies," and "soul and body-ruining doctrines," they can unite most cordially in fasting and prayer, and in cursing bitterly the "*little*" Christian Baptist!! It is a *little* thing; but *little* things—yea, "the things that are nothing," have often been employed to bring down priests and philosophers. A *little* thing!—yes, a *little* helm turns a great ship: a little tongue moves a large assembly; a goose quill has shaken many a throne, and wrested the crown from the head and the sceptre from the hand of many a despot. The *little* Christian Baptist has been too strong for the great Messrs.

Converse and Clopton and a hundred other such *big little* priests. It is the truth in it—the *mighty* truth, and no talent of its humble editor, which has achieved so much. He only is strong when the truth is on his tongue; and with *that* he can cut down an army of such Lilliputians in truth, and giants in error, as Messrs. Converse, Clopton & Co. Sampson was like other men when shorn; but Sampson, with his slender locks of hair, could burst the strong bands of the Philistines. And what are the *withes* with which these Philistines would bind the truth?—These slanders: "The deadly influence of the *little* Christian Baptist on the peace and prosperity of the Baptist churches," "the damnable heresies," "the ruinous errors" it contains! This is the argument of the vantage ground. Now I say to one and all of these men, Point out one error in the Christian Baptist, one ruinous doctrine, except to the would-be-priests, and I will thank you. I challenge you to the conflict for the faith once delivered to the saints. You can, I doubt not, excel me in all the arts of calumny and in all the logic of the vantage ground; but take some one topic; discuss it. My pages are open to you. Yes, you may send the antidote with the poison to every fireside. Come on, gentlemen. Only be a little more courteous in your manners, and you shall have page for page, line for line, and period for period with me. Talk not about the *deadly* influence of my writings. You are mistaken. 'Tis you who preach to *dead* men. 'Tis you who tell your hearers that they ought to feel like *dead* men, who have a *deadly* influence, if you have any influence at all. And I do know that you Calvinian philosophers and Fullerite preachers have a most deadly influence over the people. You have quenched the Holy Spirit in the churches with your dreams. Many of your churches are as dead as a stone. They meet once a month for a *drop of the milk* of a textuary, and how can they be healthy or lively? When you visit them, you are always milking them for some Tract, or Temperance, or Missionary, or Education, or College scheme. You seldom visit them, you seldom read them a text, or preach them a sermon, but there are as many duns as prayers, as much begging as singing, and as much death as life in your sermon. And you censure me for wakening them, for rousing them from your dreams!! You call out "*Ruinous doctrines!*" and "*Damnable heresies!*" You think you have the vantage ground, and that your bulls of excommunication will terrify me, pacify the people, and secure your dominion over them. Be not deceived: the most pious members of your communities are those who are awaking out of sleep; these are among those whose influence sustains me, cheers me in this effort to rescue the disciples from your dominion. I know personally many of the most pious and intelligent teachers and private members in the Baptist, and some in other sects, who are warmly enlisted in the cause of the restoration of the ancient order of things; and they are, and hitherto have been, the salt which preserved from putrefaction the communities to which they belonged—and because the Christian Baptist made them more zealous for purity of faith and holiness of life, you cry out, "Ruinous doctrine!"

You, Mr. Clopton, could compass Virginia, Georgia, and the Carolinas for no *per annum* almost equal to the whole profits of the Columbian Star, in obtaining subscriptions for the Columbian College and for the Star; and thus you preached the wholesome doctrine of giving liberally, and the old speculations of the English theologues such as I heard from your own lips in Richmond; and yet you call it all gospel, and sound doctrine, and that "*damnable heresy*" which calls upon men to obey the gospel and to rejoice in the Lord. As for your temperate brother Converse, and his Episcopalian coadjutor in the work of calumny, I could expect nothing better from them. Mr. Converse has treated other Baptists not any better than he has treated me; and I know it is hard to bring a clean thing out of an unclean. And as for Mr. Clopton, since the days of Diotrephes there have been such, who think theirs is the right to lord it over the faith of others without argument or proof.

But now if Mr. Clopton, or any other of the sons of the church militant, thinks he can show any error or heretical doctrine in any thing I write—be it known to him and them, that if they will write with any regard to courtesy and candor, I will permit them to publish in this paper any essay or essays which they may furnish, to show how "ruinous" and "damnable" my teaching is. If the testimony of God will not sustain me, I deserve not to be heard; but knowing as I do, that the truth is mighty above all things, and that it will prevail, I fear no man's logic, and contemn the petulance of those who declaim without argument, and reason against both truth, fact, and experience. EDITOR.

## CONFESSION UNTO SALVATION.

THE moderns talk about "head knowledge" and "heart religion"—"believing with the head," and "believing with the heart." Let me say once for all, that I value not, and will never plead for, any thing under the name of religion, which does not influence the head, the heart, the tongue, the lips, the hands, the feet—the whole body, soul, and spirit. The blessed gospel is not believed, is not received, is not obeyed, when the heart is not purified, the understanding enlightened, the conscience purged from dead works to serve the living God.

The end, object, and consummation of the gospel is "LOVE from a *pure heart*, from a *good conscience*, and from *faith unfeigned*." But I am religiously opposed to all such foolish speculations about faith or belief which make faith consist in any thing else, more or less, than the persuasion that the gospel is true. Those who distinguish between the *head* and the *heart*, between *assent* and *approbation*, usually quote the following sentence from the Epistle to the Romans, chap. x. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." The sophism which they impose upon themselves and followers in this citation, is easily detected when we observe, that, while they contrast the *head* and the *heart*,

Paul contrasts the *lips* and the *heart*. This is quite rational, natural, and common. Men's lips and hearts do not always agree. They often profess to love with their lips while their hearts are filled with hatred. The lips and hearts of all true christians agree: "As he thinketh in his heart, so doth he truth express." To apply the words of Paul to the head, is to offer violence to them, and to make the sacred writings of non-effect.

To *confess with the lips* is quite another thing from *believing with the head*. It is different, too, from sincerely believing. The "*unfeigned* faith" is the faith of the heart. But the contrast is between faith and confession—righteousness and salvation. Faith and righteousness are now connected—some way connected under the christian economy; so are confession and salvation.

Now among the commentators and sermonizers of the day, I know of none who has drawn the contrast which Paul draws here, or who marks with any sort of precision the difference here laid down: "With the heart man believes unto righteousness, and with the lips confession is made unto salvation." To confess unto salvation is different from believing unto righteousness. In whatever way we understand the phrase "*unto righteousness*," either as the effect or concomitant of believing, in the same manner we must understand the phrase "*unto salvation;*" for the phraseology and the contrast establish the same connexion between confession and salvation that there is between belief and righteousness. God bestows righteousness upon faith, and salvation upon confession. It is an act of pure favor to impute or count to a man belief for righteousness. But he did so with Father Abraham, and he has promised to do so with all his children. Under the christian economy he connects salvation with confession. It is an act of favor to treat a man as though he were righteous when he believes; and it is a similar act of favor to bestow salvation upon a person the instant he confesses Christ.

I know that the actual enjoyment of salvation in this life is a different thing from the actual enjoyment of the perfect and eternal salvation consequent upon the resurrection of the body. No man is made perfect until he attains to the resurrection of the just. As the kingdom of Jesus in this world differs from the everlasting kingdom of glory, so the salvation of the soul here, and the salvation of soul and body at the resurrection from the dead, materially differ from each other. We are saved here when we confess Christ, and we will be saved hereafter when Christ confesses us before his Father and the holy angels.

*Salvation* is a term used with much latitude in sacred and common writings. Israel were saved when they crossed the Red Sea; that is, they were then delivered from the power of their enemies. Their marching through the Red Sea was called the salvation of God. So every deliverance from danger has been called a salvation. But in the New Testament, besides the ordinary applications of the term, it is applied to denote the pardon of sin, or deliverance of the mind from guilt, and the purification of the heart from the pollution and domi-

nion of sin; and also for the future and eternal salvation of the whole man from every trace and every consequence of sin. "Now," says Paul, "is our salvation nearer than when we believed."

It was testified of John by the Holy Spirit, that he was to prepare the way of the Lord by giving knowledge of salvation through the forgiveness of sins. The salvation which all men enjoy under the government of Jesus Christ in this present world, is a salvation from the guilt, pollution, and dominion of sin. Hence Jesus saves *his people*—those under his government, from their sins. Hence in the sacred writings all who are now pardoned are said to be saved. The Lord daily added to the congregation, says Luke, THE SAVED—those who had been baptized into Christ.

To be saved is to be pardoned, to be brought under the sceptre of Jesus. Hence all who believed and were baptized, were said to be saved, because Christ had declared they should be saved. The *confession with the lips*, or the public profession of the faith, was made at baptism. Hence the connexion between this confession and salvation.

Public acts, or public professions, were called *the confessing* of Christ in the apostolic age. Jesus himself witnessed a good confession before Pontius Pilate; and the martyrs were originally called "confessors of Christ" by way of eminence, because the public profession of him before the tribunals so resembled the good confession of Jesus before Pontius Pilate as to obtain for them this honorable title. But the first public act of a disciple by which he openly and formally puts on Christ is emphatically *to confess Christ;* and because it was the immediate fruit of faith, Paul, in speaking of our entering into the enjoyment of salvation, declared that as God bestowed righteousness through faith, so under the reign of his Son, he bestows salvation through confession. So that now, under the reign of favor, it is the institution of heaven that faith and righteousness, confession and salvation, shall be inseparably connected. "With the heart man now believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." So that, saith the same authority, "if you shall confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in your heart that God has raised him from the dead, you shall be saved."

Thus our souls are saved, and thus are we prepared for the salvation to be revealed at the last day. The salvation then to be disclosed is not the pardon of sin or the purification of the heart; these were but *preparatives* for it; but then we shall be made like unto the Son of God, conformed to his image, as exactly as we have been conformed to the image of our common father Adam. "The redemption of our bodies" from the power of the grave, and the transformation of these bodies into spiritual, incorruptible, and immortal bodies, will be the ultimate triumph of the Saviour and of his disciples. He has become the King eternal, immortal, and invisible; he alone has the gift of immortality, and he alone can bestow immortality upon mortal man.

To this ultimate and eternal salvation christians turn your eyes. It is nearer to you now than when you first believed and confessed the Lord. Imitate Paul who was willing to do any thing, suffer any

thing, sacrifice every thing, that he might, "by any means, attain to the resurrection of the dead." This glorious resurrection is promised to all them who obey the great Captain of Salvation, and to none else: for he became the author of eternal salvation to all them, and to them *only*, *who obey him*—not only once, but to the end. The prize of immortal glory in the presence of God, the crown of righteousness and life, is that which none but the courageous, persevering, and triumphant, can lay hold on. As we sincerely believe that God has raised Jesus from the dead, and have confessed him before men unto salvation;—as we have begun well, "let us hold fast our begun confidence and our boasted hope unshaken to the end." Let us so run that we may obtain this most glorious prize.

EDITOR.

## AN EPISCOPALIAN WITNESS AGAINST CATECHISMS.

IT is remarkable that the most evangelical paper published in the city of Philadelphia, should be conducted and edited by an Episcopalian. I speak of the popular papers of that city. The "Philadelphia Recorder," though an Episcopalian publication, and though much in the spirit of this age, is nevertheless not only distinguished by the ability of its editor, the Rev. B. B. Smith, but by a much clearer intelligence in the Christian Revelation, than any other paper issued in that city which we are accustomed to peruse. It is true that the piece extracted below is an extract from a correspondent in that paper, but yet the editor essentially agrees with the following well written remarks upon *catechisms*, which, in our judgment, equally apply to creeds. The church of England, although the least reformed from Popery in the pomp and pageantry of form, has produced as large a host, as powerful a host, as brilliant a host of erudite, pious, and evangelical men, as any sect in christendom of the same age. And even now, although far degenerated from the spirit and power of christianity, and far fallen from what she once was, still there appears in that community, once in a jubilee, a man who has more manly views of the christian institution, and more scriptural apprehensions of the import of the good confession witnessed before Pontius Pilate, than we are accustomed to find in other sects under the influence of a more paralyzing system. Indeed, "I have not found so great faith: no, not in Israel."

*Ed. M. H.*

### CATECHISMS.

*Mr. Editor*,—There is no peculiarity of the present age which a reflecting christian will contemplate with greater pleasure, than that distinguishing confidence in the Holy Scriptures, which it generally reveals. Our Bible Society has almost realized the miracle of Pentecost; and a National Bible *Class* Society has been formed, the principal object of which is, I believe, to induce every christian shepherd to lead the younger portion of his charge (*spem gregis*) into

these green pastures of salvation. I cannot help thinking, however, that we are in danger of being betrayed into a departure from this characteristic principle of the times in which we live by the numberless little catechetical pamphlets, of all sorts and sizes, and suited to every age, that are constantly issuing from the press. It seems to me that I have met with a half dozen of them amongst the publications of a single society. Now I confess that I look upon all these anomalous little productions with suspicion. I am afraid that they will make our children content to receive their religion at second hand. Why should we lead them from the fountain of living waters to broken cisterns hewn out by mortal hands? Why should we exchange the broad canal of revelation, with its copious streams, and its unpolluted channel, for any of the little *conduit pipes*, which men have manufactured (defiled as they too often are with the feculence of human infirmity, and contracted to the dimensions of human prejudice) when our object is to convey to the hundreds and thousands of "babes in Christ," that the church carries in her arms, "the sincere milk of the word"? Why should a christian pastor present a bucketfull to his thirsty flock at the very time that in imitation of the Chief Shepherd he is (or ought to be) conducting them along the verdant margin of a bottomless and boundless sea, by whose "still waters" they may be securely refreshed?

Ah! sir, I am afraid of this rising disposition to make the word of man supersede the word of God. It looks too much like an attempt to substitute the priest for the Divinity. It is too near akin to that singular delusion [an honest one I believe in my heart] which would prohibit the scriptures from going out in their mission of mercy unless the Prayer Book can go along to explain their meaning, and prevent them from leading the people into error.——

Religious formularies should, I think, be principally intended, not for instruction, but defence; not to inculcate opinions, but to exclude them; not to convey truth, but to keep out error; not to enlighten the ignorance of children, but to restrain the licentious learning of philosophers. This is their peculiar province; when carried beyond this, there is a danger of making them take the place of that which is the best, because the appointed vehicle of religious knowledge. The sacred volume, while it contains nourishment for the intellect of an angel, has food for the understanding of a child. He who made the infant mind, who "knows what is in man," and who with such inimitable condescension takes these little ones in his arms to bless them, has given to his "babes," as their peculiar portion, that sweet maternal aliment with which the bosom of the church has been copiously supplied. Oh! let us never wrong them so far as to let them quench their thirst, not with this pure and holy beverage, but with the dirty waters that are constantly oozing from the puddles of human prejudice.

I am persuaded, sir, that scriptural truth is never so likely to produce its appropriate influence upon the hearts and consciences, as

when it is expressed in the simple, appropriate, and inspired language of the scriptures. Upon this subject, suffer me to quote the words of an eloquent divine—"What can be the cause, that in hearing the gospel it is the scriptures quoted which produces the whole scriptural effect? What can be the cause that when a sinner comes into deep troubles of conscience, it is no matter what his minister may say to him, unless he produces texts of scripture? What is the reason that old saints betake themselves to nothing but reading the scriptures? What can be the reason that at a death-bed a minister of the gospel depends on nothing else than texts of scripture? Go through the whole spiritual concerns of the human race, and put appropriate questions on each particular occurrence, and then tell me what can be the reason that we can produce no spiritual effect, no effect which we judge connected with salvation by any other instrument than the Bible."

We look to ages past, and call them dark ages, when ministers of the gospel were projecting and manufacturing a hundred thousand laws and forms and ceremonies, for the promotion of christian piety among men. All the while these ministers themselves never thought of the Bible; or if they thought of it, they said it is too difficult for the common people to understand; or is not sufficient to direct and regulate the present age; or whatever they said, they must have thought that the cause of truth and piety requires some human aid and regulation not provided for in the Bible; and so they went to work to supply the desideratum. They made bad work of it undoubtedly; we all see that; and we cry, Why did not these ministers study the Bible themselves; and why did they not diffuse it among the people? O! the reason is obvious; they actually thought that if the Bible were let loose in the world, it would turn the world upside down, and banish all rational piety. They have actually told us as much; and that we might more readily believe them, they have taken the trouble to have the matter decided in presbyteries, synods, and councils, in all the infallible dignity which human impotence can confer upon human folly.

After all the pious pains of the ministry to keep the Bible from doing mischief in the church of God, it at last got out into the world, and began its tremendous operations. The people were soon as wise as their priests. They were surrounded by the glorious light of heaven; and all the surly brood of errors, corruptions, and encroachments, that loved darkness rather than light, fled away forever. Mr. Editor, let us beware how we take one retrogressive step towards his former state of vassalage and ignorance. And, sir, the boast which some of us are so fond of flourishing in the face of our Roman Catholic opposers, that "the Bible and Bible *only*, is the religion of Protestants," will never be appropriate until all our *human* Bibles shall be thrown into the fire, or at least dislodged from that place in our churches and our schools, which can only be safely occupied by *the simple, unadulterated oracles of God*.

## EXTRACT OF A CIRCULAR LETTER,

*Written by* WALTER SCOTT, *for the Mahoning Association of last year.*

BELOVED BRETHREN—

THE Christian of the 19th century has been permitted to witness the accomplishment of wonderful events; Providence has stationed him on a sublime eminence, from which he can behold the fulfilment of illustrious prophecies, and look backwards upon nearly the whole train of events leading to the *Millennium.*

Afar off, and upon the back ground of the picture before him, of wonderful extent, and in all the greatness of imperial ruin, appear the three great empires of Babylon, Persia, and Greece. Nearer to hand lays Rome, eternal Rome! terriole in her origin, terrible in her glory, terrible in her *decline* and *fall!* Living and acting through a long series of ages, she approaches the very verge of the present scene of things, till she assumes the distracted form of the ten kingdoms spoken of by Daniel, the remains of which now reel to and fro upon the face of Europe like a drunken man, ready to be ingulphed in the yawning judgments of Almighty God. *Sic transit Gloria Mundi.**

But from amidst the blaze of her glory, see yet loftier scenes arise —Behold the kingdom of our Lord Jesus, awaking under the eye of the imperial *Cesars;* small in its beginning, it rolls forward, it survives all Roman greatness: and that which was yonder, a little stone, is here become a vast mountain, and fills the whole earth; the waters which yonder issued from the threshold of the Lord's house, have here arisen, they have become waters to swim in—a river that cannot be passed over!

Here, too, are the impostures of Mahomet and the Pope, with temples having the lowermost part consecrated to God—the upper to the worship of idols. Arrayed in purple and scarlet, decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, behold the apostate church, mounted upon her imperial beast, holds forth to the intoxicated nations a golden cup in her hand, full of abomination and of the filthiness of her fornication; on her fair, but unblushing forehead, is inscribed *Mystery—Babylon the Great—the Mother of Harlots, and abominations of the earth.* She shall be thrown down with the violence of a mill-stone plunged into the midst of the ocean.

Her portentous offspring also, issued to mankind at the mature age of 666, with the head of a Lamb and the heart of a Dragon—the *Inquisition* raiseth itself on high, with the power, the delusion, and cruelty, of its parent—it comes roving o'er the earth, and causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their forehead—and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

* *So passes the glory of the world.*

Here, also, is the French Atheism, filled with all presumption, and magnifying himself above every God—he speaketh marvellous things against the true God—his hands are filled with spears, and his skirts are drenched in blood; but he shall come to his end, says Daniel, and none shall help him.

All these things, beloved brethren, have passed in review before the christian of the nineteenth century; but if we have had to witness schemes of policy and superstition, so wild and enthusiastic, and apparently so unfavorable to the true religion, we have seen many things introduced, also highly conducive to its promulgation and reception among mankind. Above all, we have seen the church in America, seated down under a gracious and efficient government, affording her and all men an unprecedented security of life and property; and if her unity be still a desideratum, we ought to remember that the saints, for nearly three hundred years, have been combatting tyranny and superstition with astonishing success, until those who despise every name and every phrase not found in the scripture, have become probably by far the most numerous party of professors in the United States.

But who would have thought it remained for any, so late as 1827, to restore to the world the manner, the primitive manner, of administering to mankind the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ? or which of you, brethren, would have thought, two years ago, of men coming from forty to a hundred and twenty miles to the ministers of the Mahoning churches for baptism? Yet these things have actually occurred. And who cannot see that, by the blessings of God, the ancient gospel and ancient order of the church must prevail to the certain abolition of all those contumacious sects which now so wofully afflict mankind.

Brethren, we have a right to expect great things at the hand of our Father—if we are united and stand fast, striving together for the faith of the gospel. And be it known to you, brethren, that individuals, eminently skilled in the word of God, the history of the world, and the progress of human improvement, see reason to expect changes much greater than have yet occurred, and which shall give to political society, and to the church, a different, a very different complexion from what many anticipate.

The Millennium—the Millennium described in scripture, will doubtless be a wonder, a terrible wonder to ALL!

The gospel, since last year, has been preached, with great success, in Palmyra, Deerfield, Randolph, Shalersville, Nelson, Hiram, &c. &c. by brothers Finch, Hubbard, Ferguson, Bosworth, Hayden, and others. Several new churches have been formed; and so far as I am enabled to judge, the congregations are in a very flourishing condition: indeed, the preacher of the present day, like the angel of the Revelation, seated on the triumphant cloud, has only to thrust in his sharp sickle in order to reap a rich harvest of souls, and gather it in unto eternal life.

*From the Wheeling Compiler.*

## KENTTUCKY ANTI-SLAVERY.

TWO bills have been introduced into the legislature of Kentucky, both of which, it is said, will pass. One provides for the emancipation of all slaves brought into the commonwealth for sale: the other prohibits the use of jails within the state, for the purpose of confining slaves for safe keeping. It thus appears that slavery is becoming unpopular in Kentucky.

Mr. Clay has recently delivered an address at Frankfort, before the Colonization Society at that place. Mr. Clay speaks decidedly in commendation of rooting out slavery from Kentucky. He says—

"The African part of our population, or their ancestors, were brought hither forcibly and by violence, in the prosecution of the most abominable traffic that ever disgraced the annals of the human race. They were chiefly procured in their native country, as captives in war, taken and consequently sold by the conqueror as slaves to the slave-trader. Sometimes the most atrocious practices of kidnapping were employed to obtain possession of the victims. Wars were frequent between numerous and barbarous neighboring tribes seated along the coasts or stretched upon the margin of large rivers of Africa. These wars were often enkindled and prosecuted for no other object than to obtain a supply of subjects for this most shocking commerce. In those modes husbands were torn from their wives, parents from their children, brethren from each other, and every tie cherished and respected among men was violated. Upon the arrival, at the African coasts, of the unfortunate beings thus reduced to slavery, they were embarked on board the ships carefully constructed and arranged to contain the greatest amount of human beings. Here they were ironed and fastened in parallel rows, and crowded together so closely, in loathsome holes, as not to have room for action or for breathing wholesome air. The great aim was to transport the largest possible number, at the least possible charge, from their native land to the markets for which they were destined. The greediness of cupidity was frequently disappointed and punished in its purposes, by the loss of moieties of whole cargoes of the subjects of this infamous commerce, from want, and suffering, and disease on the voyage. How much happier were they who thus expired, than their miserable survivors!

"These African slaves were brought to the continent of America, and the islands adjacent to it, and formed the parent stock of the race now amongst us. They were brought to the colonies now constituting the United States, under the sanction and by the authority of the British laws, which, at an early period of our colonial existence, admitted and tolerated the trade. It is due to our colonial ancestors, to say, that they frequently and earnestly, but unsuccessfully, remonstrated to the British Crown against the continuance of the practice. The introduction of slavery into this country is not,

therefore, chargeable to them, but to a government in which they had no voice, and over which they had no control. It is equally due to our parent state to advert to the honorable fact, that in the midst of the revolutionary war, when contending for her own independence and liberty, she evinced the sincerity of the spirit in which those remonstrances had been addressed to the British throne, by denouncing, under the severest penalties, the further prosecution of the slave trade, within their jurisdiction. And I add, with great satisfaction, that the Congress of the United States passed an act, abolishing the trade as early as by their Constitution it was authorized to do. On the second day of March, 1807, the act was passed for which it was my happy lot to vote; the first section of which enacts, "that from and after the first day of January, 1808, it shall not be lawful to import or bring into the United States or the territories thereof, from any foreign kingdom, place, or country, any negro, mulatto, or person of color, with intent to hold, sell, or dispose of such negro, mulatto, or person of color, as a slave, or to be held to service or labor." Thus terminated, we may hope forever, in the United States, a disgraceful traffic, which drew after it a train of enormities surpassing in magnitude, darkness, and duration, any that ever sprang from any trade, pushed by the enterprise or cupidity of man.

"The several states of the Union were sensible of the responsibility which accrued to them on the establishment of the independence of the United States, in regard to the subject of slavery. And many of them, beginning at a period prior to the termination of the revolutionary war, by successive, but distinct acts of legislation, have effectively provided for the abolition of slavery within their respective jurisdictions. More than thirty years ago, an attempt was made in this Commonwealth to adopt a system of gradual emancipation, similar to that which the illustrious Franklin had mainly contributed to introduce, in the year 1779, in the state founded by the benevolent Penn. And, among the acts of my life, to which I look back with the most satisfaction, is that of my having co-operated, with other zealous and intelligent friends, to procure the establishment of that system in this state. We believe that the sum of good which would have been attained by the state of Kentucky, in a gradual emancipation of her slaves, at that period, would have far transcended the aggregate of mischief which might have resulted to herself and the Union together, from the gradual liberation of them, and their dispersion and residence in the United States. We were overpowered by numbers, but submitted to the decision of the majority with the grace which a minority, in a republic, should ever yield to such a decision. I have, nevertheless, never ceased, and never shall cease, to regret a decision, the effects of which have been to place us in the rear of our neighbors, who are exempt from slavery, in the state of agriculture, the progress of manufactures, the advance of improvements, and the general prosperity of society."

## THE DOUBLE SENSE OF SCRIPTURE.

THE darkness of mysticism is fast passing away. The double sense, or the triple and quadruple sense of scripture, once so fashionable, so erudite, so sacred, amongst the great mass of Protestant and Catholic commentators and sermonizers, is falling much into disrepute amongst the most learned and pious of this generation. The textuary mode of interpreting, which grew out of the *equivocal* sence of scripture, will soon be confined to the more enthusiastic and weak minds of the sectaries. Enlightened men of all denominations are fast abandoning the *double* sense, and many are ashamed of the textuary mode of treating the sacred writings. The following extracts are from the Religious Herald of Richmond, and from the pen of the Editor, a brother alike respected and esteemed by all who know him, both for his erudition and his undissembled piety. The remarks under date of the 22d ult. seem to have been elicited by an unprovoked attack of Mr. Brantly on the Editor of the Herald. The Editor of the Star aggrieved, perhaps, that his twinklings were becoming very dim in Virginia, and desirous of being the keeper of the press, the metropolitan Editor of the Union, as well as the keeper of the rolls of orthodoxy among the Baptists, lately pounced upon the Herald with his usual tact and characteristic superciliousness. I see that brother Keeling brings a new and a learned witness into the ranks of those who fight against the double sense of scripture. We shall give the remarks of the Religious Herald and the quotation from Professor Stuart, in full. Ed. M. H.

"Were it not an undeniable fact, it would scarcely be credible, that the sacred writings—a professed and real communication from heaven to men on the most momentous subjects, have been strained and distorted from their obvious meaning in the manner and to the extent they have, by forced and unnatural construction and interpretation. As a fair specimen of the extravagant spirit of allegorizing, and typifying, and spiritualizing literal expressions and facts, it is sufficient to mention that one of the Apostolic Fathers themselves understood the red line which hung out from the window of the harlot Rahab, as a signal to the spies, to be a *type* of the blood of Christ—a symbolical representation of the blood which was to be shed for the remission of sins. Similar abuses have come down to the present age; and the columns of this paper have offered frequent aid to those who from the press and the pulpit are endeavoring to extricate the inspired volume from expositions, which produce no better effects than modification, confusion, ridicule, and scepticism according to the classes of persons in whose presence they are made.

These remarks are elicited by some strictures (if they can be properly called strictures) lately published in the 'Columbian Star,' in consequence of a comparison instituted in this paper, between the views of Bishop Heber, and a correspondent 'Melancthon,' who in a series of essays furnished for the 'Herald,' had introduced the parable of the good Samaritan.' Bishop Heber thus interprets: 'The

story, if we take it in its *plainest sense*, told them (to whom the Saviour spoke) more forcibly than ten thousand arguments, to do unto others as they would wish that others should do unto them. But this was not the *only*, nor the *main intention* of the parable, which as it applied to the lawyer, was to prove the claims which Christ had to his love and gratitude, and to show the total insufficiency of the law of Moses to rescue human nature from its miserable condition. The unfortunate plundered traveller *is then a representative of all mankind*. They, like him, have departed from Jerusalem the city of God, his favor, or the light of his countenance, and set their faces towards the pursuits and pleasures of the world; those temptations, which are represented under the name of Jericho, a town which, as you will read in the book of Joshua, was devoted to everlasting ruin.' He proceeds to spiritualize the whole parable. The priest, the Levite, and the thieves, represent the sacrifices and the Levitical law and Satan; and that the "good Samaritan is a type of Christ, he proves from the declaration of the Jews to Christ 'Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil.' But 'Melancthon,' our correspondent, in his 10th essay, published on the 27th of November last, took a different view of the subject. He understood the whole scope of the parable 'to correct the lawyer's false ideas of neighborship.' This ought to be obvious to every man of common sense. The youth had asked Christ the question, 'What must I do to inherit eternal life?' and had been referred to the commandments including his whole duty to God and his neighbor. But 'who is my neigbor?' continued he. He is informed that any human being, although of a nation between which and his own the strongest antipathies might exist, as between the Samaritans and Jews, if in suffering circumstances, was his neighbor. That this was the scope and design of the parable is farther evident from the moral of it given by Christ himself, 'Who thinkest thou was neighbor to him that fell among thieves?' either of those that left him unrelieved? or did he act that part, who afforded him the necessary aid? 'Go thou and do likewise.' For favoring the latter interpretation, the Editor of the Star has called this paper to account, and pronounces this method of interpreting the scripture neither 'good divinity' nor sound criticism. By ministers of the gospel and others of the first respectability for talent, learning and piety, on all sides of us, this has been declared in their private correspondence, an 'unwarrantable attack.

No farther trespass shall be made at present upon the patience of the reader, as to this subject, than to quote the following passage from Professor Stuart's incomparable commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews. Speaking of the difficulties attendant upon the proper interpretation of the 40th Psalm, he says:

'To avoid these some have supposed that the first and last parts of the Psalm in question relate to David, while verse 7—9, 6—8, contain a prediction respecting the Messiah, at least that they are spoken concerning him.' * * * 'Others have maintained that the whole Psalm relates only to David; and that consequently, the apostle Paul

*accommodates* his argument to the Jewish allegorical explanation of it, probably current at the time when he wrote.' But while he opposes this, he adds, 'Nor does that scheme of interpretation which admits a *double sense* of scripture, relieve our difficulties. This scheme explains so much of the psalm as will most conveniently apply to David, as having a *literal* application to him; and so much of it as will conveniently apply to the Messiah, it refers to him. Truly a great saving in investigation, and of perplexity, and difficulty might apparently be made, if we could adopt such an expedient. But the consequence of admitting such a principle should be well weighed. What book on earth has a *double* sense, unless it is a book of designed *enigmas!* And even this has but *one real* meaning. The heathen oracles, indeed, could say, Aio te, Pyrrhe Romanos posse vincere;* but can such an equivoque be admissible into the oracles of the living God? And if a *literal* sense and an occult sense can at one and the same time, and by the same words, be conveyed, who that is uninspired shall tell us what the *occult* sense is? By what laws of interpretation is it to be judged? By none that belong to human language; for other books than the Bible have not a double sense attached to them. For these and such like reasons, the scheme of attaching *double* sense to the scriptures is inadmissible. It sets afloat all the fundamental principles of interpretation by which we arrive at established conviction and certainty, and casts us upon the boundless ocean of imagination and conjecture without rudder or compass."

## RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.

MANY good men whose whole lives have been one continued struggle with themselves, one continued warfare against error and iniquity, have reprobated religious controversy as a great and manifold evil to the combatants and to society. Although engaged in a real controversy, they knew it not; but supposed that they only were controversialists who were in debates and discussions often. Had they reflected but a moment, they would have discovered that no man can be a good man who does not oppose error and immorality in himself, his family, his neighborhood, and in society as far as he can reach, and that he cannot oppose it successfully only by argument, or, as some would say, by word and deed—by precept and by example.

There can be no improvement without controversy. Improvement requires and presupposes change; change is innovation, and innovation always has elicited opposition, and that is what constitutes the essentials of controversy. Every man who reforms his own life has a controversy with himself. And, therefore, no man who has not always been perfect, and always been in company with perfect so-

*Ambiguous. It may be rendered 'I say, Pyrrhus, that the Romans can conquer you,' or 'I say Pyrrhus that you can conquer the Romans.' So the oracle declared the truth, on which side soever the victory might be.

ciety, can be a good man without controversy. This being conceded, (and who can refuse to concede it?) it follows that whensoever society, religious or political, falls into error, or rather, so long as it is imperfect, it is the duty of all who have any talent or ability to oppose error, moral or political, who have intelligence to distinguish, and utterance to express, truth and goodness, to lift up a standard against it, and to panoply themselves for the combat.

But yet, plain and obvious as the preceding remarks may be, many will contend that religious controversy, oral or written, is incompatible with the pacific and contemplative character of the genuine christian, and promotive of strifes, tumults, and factions in society, destructive of true piety towards God and of benevolence towards man. This is a prejudice arising from the abuses of controversy. Admit for a moment that it were so, and what would be the consequence? It would unsaint and unchristianize evey distinguished Patriarch, Jew, and Christian enrolled in the sacred annals of the world. For who of the Bible's great and good men was not engaged in religious controversy! To go no farther back than the Jewish lawgiver, I ask, What was his character? I need not specify. Whenever it was necessary, all—yes, all the renowned men of antiquity were religious controversialists. Moses long contended with the Egyptian magi. He overcame Jannes and Jambres too. Elijah encountered the prophets of Baal. Job long debated with the princes of Edom. The Jewish prophets and the idolatrous kings of Israel waged a long and arduous controversy. John the Harbinger, and the Scribes and Pharisees, met in conflict. Jesus, and the Rabbis, and the Priesthood, long debated. The Apostles and the Sanhedrim; the Evangelists and the Doctors of Divinity; Paul and the Sceptics, engaged in many a conflict; and even Michael fought in "wordy debate" with the Devil about the body of Moses; yet who was more meek than Moses—more zealous for God than Elijah—more patient than Job—more devout than Paul—more benevolent than John?

If there was no error in principle or practice, then controversy, which is only another name for opposition to error, real or supposed, would be unnecessary. If it were lawful, or if it were benevolent, to make a truce with error, then opposition to it would be both unjust and unkind. If error were innocent and harmless, then we might permit it to find its own quietus, or to immortalize itself. But so long as it is confessed that error is more or less injurious to the welfare of society, individually and collectively considered, then no man can be considered benevolent who does not set his face against it. In proportion as a person is intelligent and benevolent, he will be controversial, if error exist around him. Hence the Prince of Peace never sheathed the sword of the Spirit while he lived. He drew it on the banks of Jordan and threw the scabbard away.

We have only to ask how we inherited so many blessings, religious and political, contrasted with our ancestors some five hundred years ago, to ascertain of what use controversy has been, and how much we are indebted to it. All was silent and peaceful as the grave under

the gloomy sceptre of Roman Pontiffs, under the despotic sway of the Roman hierarchy, until Luther opened the war. The Roman priesthood denounced the "ruinous errors" and "damnable heresies" of Luther, the "*deadly influence*" of the tongue and pen of the hiersiarch; but they fasted, and prayed, and denounced in vain. No crocodile tears "over the souls of men;" no religious penances for "the church in danger;" no invocation of "all who loved Zion;" no holy co-operation of "the friends of evangelical principles," could check the career of this reforming Hercules. Bulls of excommunication assailed him as stubble would Leviathan in the deep. "He feared no discipline of human hands." All was impotent and unavailing. The fire then kindled, though oft suppressed, yet burns.

The controversy begun by Luther, not only maimed the power of the Roman hierarchy, but also impaired the arm of political despotism. The *crown*, as well as the *mitre*, was jeopardized and desecrated by his herculean pen. From the controversy about the *rights of christians* arose the controversy about *the rights of men*. Every blow inflicted upon ecclesiastical despotism was felt by the political tyrants.

Religious controversy has enlightened the world. It gave new vigor to the mind; and the era of the Reformation was the era of the Revival of Literature. It has enlightened men upon all subjects—in all the arts and sciences—in all things—philosophic, literary, moral, political. It was the tongue and pen of controversy which developed the true solar system—laid the foundation for the American Revolution—abolished the slave trade—and which has so far disenthralled the human mind from the shackles of superstition. Locke and Sidney, Milton and Newton, were all controversialists and reformers, philosophers, literary, religious and political. Truth and liberty, both religious and political, are the first fruits of well directed controversy. Peace and eternal bliss will be the "harvest home." Let the opponents of controversy, or they who *controvert controversy*, remember, that had there been no controversy, neither the Jewish nor the Christian religion could have ever been established; nor had it ceased could the Reformation have ever been achieved. It has been the parent of almost all the social blessings which we enjoy.

If, indeed, all mankind were equally in love with truth, equally rational, equally intelligent, and equally disinterested, we might have only to propose a change for the better, and all would embrace it. But just the reverse of this is the true history of society. He is but little experienced in the human heart—he knows but little of the world, who imagines that what appears clear, wise, and useful to *him*, appears so to *all;* or that it is only necessary to support truth and goodness by unanswerable arguments, to render them universally triumphant. The more clearly and forcibly an unpopular truth is argued, the greater will be the dislike to it by all who are interested in representing it to be an error. Melancthon was for a time the subject of an illusion of this sort. He once told Luther that so clear were his apprehensions, so deep his convictions, and so forcible his arguments, that he could soon convince all Germany of the truth of

the Reformation principles. He became an itinerant, and commenced a campaign against the priesthood. On returning from his first tour, Luther said to him, "Well, Melancthon, what speed?" "Alas!" replied the young reformer, "old Adam is too strong for young Melancthon."

A little experience will convince the most astute that the clearness and force of argument will not subdue opposition. It very frequently provokes the greater resentment. The adversaries of the Messiah are proof of this. So were the aristocrats in the late Virginia Convention. Orpheus could, by his music, as easily have caused the oaks to follow him, as could the republicans, by their arguments and demonstrations, have caused the oligarchs in power to consent to extend equal rights and immunities to the proscribed casts in this commonwealth.

When error has but a single ally in the corruptions of the human heart, it is very formidable; but how strong when pride, passion, and interest become its auxiliaries! To overcome these, reason and logic must be strong indeed, and rhetoric most persuasive. Pride, ambition, and selfishness, are all powerful allies of error. Hence double, triple, and quadruple the evidence necessary to *convert* a layman, will not often *convince* a priest. The pride of the understanding is the most invincible of all sorts of pride, and more especially when religion is the problem. A bigoted sceptic, a prejudiced sectary, and an interested priest, are more without the pale of reason, are more beyond the reach of controversy, than the errorists of any other school. But while error lives, and falsehood has an auxiliary upon earth, controversy will be necessary, and argument indispensable.

When controversy proceeds from benevolence it will be more successful and less injurious to the comfort of them who are engaged in it. But when argument and debate are dictated by resentment, prompted by pride, or controlled by the lust of power, the hearts of the combatants must be polluted, and their passions inflamed. The wrath of man never did, and it never can, effect the righteousness which God requires, nor can it promote the happiness of man. When we love truth for its own sake, and when our efforts to maintain it proceed from brotherly kindness and love to all men, then we will plead its cause with force and with success; and then, and then only, will we be sanctified and blessed in the work. But a controversy for opinion, or for truth, instituted by vanity, by the pride of understanding, or the lust of power, will pollute the heart, aggravate the passions, sour the temper, and terminate in vain jangling. But because it has been *abused* shall we desist from the *use* of it? This would be to make a covenant with death, and an agreement with destruction. This would be to live in vain, and to die without honor. This would be to depart from the example of the Confessors, Martyrs, and Apostles of Jesus, and to renounce our allegiance to the King eternal, immortal, and invisible. For so long as error in principle and in practice exists, so long will it be the duty and the felicity of the intelligent and the good to oppose it: and as long as there are conflicting creeds,

sects, and divisions among religionists, so long will it be our duty to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.

But never was there so much need to study the "*suaviter in modo*," and the "*fortiter in re*," amiability in the manner, and firmness in the purpose, as in the defence of truth. We must conciliate the passions, while we besiege the understanding. We are not to suppose all our opponents to be knaves and impostors, to be interested and obstinate. We must remember that in this world of weakness and of error the good and the virtuous are often found enlisted under the banners of error. There are honest differences of opinion, and men equally sincere and virtuous on both sides of every question. This must never be lost sight of. It is nevertheless true that our great models, the Prophets and Apostles; nay, the Saviour himself, though often mild as the genial influence of Spring, were sometimes severe and surly as the Winter's blast. At one time, and amidst one class of opponents, they were as gentle as the balmy zephyrs on beds of violets; at another time, and amidst other opponents, they were like the mountain storm roaring through the cliffs. Soft and persuasive were their words and arguments to those who appeared honest in their convictions, but severe and tart were their reproofs to such as appeared obstinate in error. Hence Paul, who instructed his son Timothy to imitate him in all things, admonished him to instruct some opponents "with all meekness," and "sharply to rebuke and confute others." So did Peter and Jude in their epistles. "Make a difference," says Jude, "between those who are complainers, who walk according to their own lusts, whose mouths speak great swelling words, and admire men's persons for the sake of gain;" have compassion upon other errorists;" "save them with fear, hating the garments spotted by the pollutions of the flesh. No man ever spoke more severely of certain teachers than Peter in his second epistle. We must, in all our controversies, make the same differences. When we find persons, like Balaam, obstinately intent on covetous courses, for the sake of others we must not spare them. But courtesy and benevolence will be our best guides; and a good example will often achieve more than a thousand arguments.

To your posts, then, O Israel! Remember you have enlisted not for *six months*, like some of our sectarian militia; but you have vowed allegiance *during the war*. "Fight the good fight of faith." Keep your eyes upon the Captain; and when the conflict is over he will cover you with laurels which will never wither, and bestow upon you a crown of righteousness which fadeth not away.

EDITOR.

## THE CHEROKEE INDIANS.

THE "*rights of man*," one would think, are any thing and every thing which any body and every body pleases to make them, if we yield to the opinions of those who maintain that any state in this Union has a right to seize the property and exile or banish the

owner, because he is red, or yellow, or some other unfashionable color. But that is not the question—it is this: Have treaties any sanction, any validity, any faith? Have the parties to any covenant or compact any right? Or is it the right of the strong always to plunder the property and insult the person of the weak. Has one man, because he is rich and has many friends, the right to seize the farm of his poor neighbor and give him a tract in the moon, or in "*No Man's Island*" for it, just as he pleases? All this, and even more than this, is assumed by Georgia in reference to the Cherokee Indians, as I understand her wishes respecting this most important community of the aborigines, to whom God gave this continent. I am glad that the eyes of christendom and of the world, are now upon the representatives of this nation of republics—this government of principles and laws; for if none but the eyes of God were upon some of them, I think they would send these poor defenceless Indians beyond the Rocky Mountains, if it would not cost too much.

On the question whether the Cherokees, in part civilized, and some say, in part a christianized tribe of Indians, now residing within the territory of Georgia, are under its jurisdiction, *ipso facto*, in despite of all treaty, Mr. *Garrison*, junior Editor of the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, makes the following very pertinent and forcible remarks:—

"Questions of national justice are above the spirit of party: their discussion, therefore, is within the *province*, and becomes the *duty*, of every Editor. In the selections of candidates men may honestly differ, without impeaching their integrity or discernment; but the principles of equity are too broad and palpable to be misapprehended, or to render division excusable.

"The question of INDIAN RIGHTS should unite the hearts and voices of the American people, from Maine to the Rocky Mountains. It is simple, significant, weighty. It is not whether the Indians would gain or lose by emigration—whether their removal would better secure the safety of Georgia or Alabama—whether they have cultivated ten or ten thousand acres of their lands—whether they have been reclaimed from their former savage habits, and are now a civilized and christian people; but it is simply, Whether the faith of the United States is not only solemnly plighted to protect them, *forever*, from invasion, violence, and fraud? Expediency and policy are convertible terms, full of dishonesty and oppression. Justice is eternal, and its demands cannot safely be evaded."

"It is *not* a fact that the Cherokees are within the jurisdiction of Georgia, or of any other state. They are as distinct as any member of the Union, and as *national* and *independent* as Great Britain itself. A hundred and fifty treaties can be produced to sustain their pretensions. The laws of Georgia can no more be justly imposed on them, than upon individuals residing in Massachusetts or Maine, or in the Persian Empire. They have never submitted themselves to the government of the whites—they probably never will submit—and no power, we trust, will compel them to submit. They do not infringe

upon state or national rights. Their location interferes with nothing but the avarice of Georgia, and a better one, for themselves and the country, cannot be found this side of the Pacific. In fine, their forcible removal would brand this country with eternal infamy, and expose it to the accumulated vengeance of Heaven."

I humbly trust there is yet so much justice, so much pure republicanism, so much regard to truth and national faith, in the bosoms of the American people and of their representatives in congress, as will not permit them to give up an innocent and harmless nation to the cupidity of a few capitalists in Georgia or any where else.

EDITOR.

## MISCELLANEA.

*From the New York Baptist Repository.*

☞"A MINISTER WANTED."

"WANTED, as a pastor over the African Baptist Church in Boston, a capable and pious colored minister; one who is well educated, sound in principles, and of good report. To such a man a handsome support will be given. None need apply unless well recommended.

Sister churches of the same faith and order, should they hear or know of a person qualified to take charge of the above church, they are respectfully requested to forward information to John T. Hilton, clerk of the church.

Done by order and in behalf of the church, this 11th of January, 1830. [Signed] JOHN T. HILTON, *Church Clerk.*"

[Specify the sum; and if respectable, you will find a man; for every man has a price.]

"And when they told it to Jotham, he went and stood in the top of mount Gerizim, and lifted up his voice, and cried, and said unto them, Hearken unto me, ye men of Shechem, that God may hearken unto you.

"The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them; and they said unto the olive-tree, Reign thou over us.

"But the olive-tree said unto them, Should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honor God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees?

"And the trees said to the fig-tree, Come thou, and reign over us.

"But the fig-tree said unto them, Should I forsake my sweetness, and my good fruit, and go to be promoted over the trees?

"Then said the trees unto the vine, Come thou, and reign over us.

"And the vine said unto them, Should I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees?

"Then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou, and reign over us.

"And the bramble said unto the trees, If in truth ye anoint me king over you, then come and put your trust in my shadow; and if not, let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon."—*Judges* ix.

## GEORGIA SLAVES.

A LAW has just been enacted by the state of Georgia, which prohibits the teaching of any slave Negro, or free person of color, to *read* or to *write*, either in written or printed characters, under penalty of fine, whipping, or imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.—Should a *white* person be engaged in so nefarious a transaction—(for instance, should some benevolent lady undertake to teach a colored Sunday School)—such person is liable to 300 dollars fine, and imprisonment in the common jail.—[*Baptist Repository.*]

[When, in the Virginia Convention, representation was claimed for Negroes, *it was affirmed that they had souls.* This new discovery was divulged as of recent date. It seems the Georgia wise men have not yet found it out. This is the year 1830, if I mistake not, and yet, even *now*, the person who will dare, male or female, to give the knowledge of letters to a slave, shall pay for it as a crime to be punished by the Judge. Knowledge and slavery are incompatible. The priests made this discovery before Alfred the Great mounted the throne. Let this barbarous law of Georgia be out-Heroded by any enactment, of any age or country. Produce its superior who can.—*Ed. M. H.*

## FIRST SETTLEMENTS OF THE COLONIES.

THE following is one of the useful memoranda, found in the new American Almanac. Virginia was settled in 1607; New York, 1614; Massachusetts, 1620; New Hampshire, 1623; New Jersey, 1624; Delaware, 1657; Maine, 1630; Maryland, 1633; Connecticut, 1635; Rhode Island, 1636; North Carolina, 1650; South Carolina, 1670; Pennsylvania, 1682; Georgia, 1733. [*Wellsburg Gaz.*]

## DANGER OF TELLING THE TRUTH.

IN a late number of the "*Christian Baptist*" I took the liberty of making a remark upon Mr. Moore's prayer in Convention. This worthy prelate of all Virginia was wont to pull his prayer out of one pocket and his spectacles out of another. This was "the head and front of my offending." To tell the truth is sometimes slander; and so the Bishop or some of his Curates imagine. For "*An Episcopalian*," whether the Bishop of all Virginia, or one of his Curates, I know not, (he conceals his name,) has poured upon me some three or four columns of the lowest species of abuse, surcharged with falsehood and malignity, through the courtesy of Mr. Converse's vehicle of *southern light.* This circumstance admonishes me to give early notice in this work, that no *anonymous* abuse shall ever be noticed in it.

We have always given our adversaries with, or without name, a fair hearing, and we have presented almost every thing written against us in the Christian Baptist. But in conducting this work our course shall be as follows:—All opposers who give their names with their arguments, shall, as far as our pages permit, and so far as there is reason in their objections, be respectfully attended to. But all persons who are either afraid or ashamed to publish their names,

shall have the privilege of abusing us without any notice on our part, unless attacks are made on our moral character. And this we are bound by every consideration to protect. Bishops, priests, and curates, whose pride is wounded or whose tricks are exposed, when they wish to abuse us without notice, will please do it anonymously.

EDITOR.

## ☞NOTICE.☜

HAVING been absent from home from the 22d September last, till the first day of February, I find a great accumulation of business, and am much in the arrears in every department of my attentions. This number is issued one month later than was intended. Wishing to keep the volumes within the years, which is a great desideratum on many accounts. we have daled it January 1. It is not a fair specimen of the work. We were obliged to furnish the copy for the compositor with the ordinary despatch of letter-writing. It is all prefatory. The documents pertaining to millennial affairs require much arrangement, and must be preceded with essays on Chronological, Historical, and Geographical matters. We wish to put every reader in possession of such documents as will throw light on both Testaments, especially on the prophetic writings. The numbers of the Christian Baptist wanting to complete the seventh volume, will be furnished as soon as possible—the February and March numbers in a few days.

In forwarding this first number we may have sent it to some who do not desire it. Such will please carefully to envelope the first number and send it back, otherwise we shall continue to send it, considering them as subscribers. If any have been overlooked, who ordered it, they will please inform us, and the back numbers will be furnished.

## MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE *MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

Received from each of the following persons $2 for the Millennial Harbinger. I L Nelson, Madison Walthall, and I H Walthall, Richmond, Va. –R Clark and J M Anderson, Fredericksburg, Va.—A. Rennolds, Loretto, Va.—L Boulware, New Town, Va.—T H Lipscomb, Mount Pleasant, Va.—H Frazier, Twyman's Store, Va.—Captain R Campbell and W Saunders, Enfield, Va.–Dr. T Cox, Hicksford, Va.—J Bowers, Col. C Todd, F O Sutton, R Sale, P Woolfolk, and H Jones, Bowling Green, Va.—I Smith, Fauquier Court House, Va.—G Mason, Chilesburg, Va.—O Welsh, Orange Court House, Va. —S E Shepherd, Alba, Pa.—I M'Cready for himself and J Moore, Greensburgh, Pa.—S Sala, Canton, Ohio.—Elder J Rigdon for J Hough, Ashland, Ohio.—T W Ewing, Elkton, Ky.—A Kyle, Esq. Harrodsburg, Ky.—I S Vail, Goshen, N. Y.—T R Lamer, Macon, Ga.

*Postage for the Millennial Harbinger.*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Under one hundred miles, | - - - | 2¼ cents per number |
| Over one hundred miles, | - - - | 5 cents per number |

☞It is two super-royal sheets in duodecimo.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 2. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1830. Vol. I.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## JOHN THE HARBINGER, OR THE CHARACTER OF A REFORMER.

THE great Eras of the world have been marked with signal judgments as well as with signal mercies. Every great epoch of mercy has been an epoch of vengeance. The Deluge, the Emancipation of Israel from Egypt, the Babylonish Captivity, and the Christian Institution, are the strongly marked epocha of sacred history. So will be the ruin of Babylon the Great. The fall, ruin, and dispersion of the Jews, was called "*the impending vengeance*"—in the common version, "*the wrath to come*" upon the Jews, for the rejection and crucifixion of the Messiah. It was called the *impending vengeance* during the ministry of John the Harbinger: "Who has prompted you, Pharisees and Sadducees, to flee from the *impending vengeance*, about to fall upon this nation." Yes, says Jesus, "I send you prophets, and wise men, and scribes. Some of them you will kill and crucify; others you will scourge in your synagogues, and banish from city to city: so that all the innocent blood shed upon the earth shall be charged upon you, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zachariah son of Barachia, whom you slew between the altar and the sanctuary. Indeed, I say to you, all shall be charged upon this generation."* It was, therefore, an era of vengeance as well as an era of mercy.

The coming of the Harbinger, and the rising of the Sun of Mercy, were associated in prophecy by the last of the Jewish line of prophets, with a day of fiery indignation: "Behold," says Malachi, "the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all who do wickedly, shall be as stubble; and the day which approacheth shall burn them up, leaving them neither root nor branch." "I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord." "This," says Jesus, referring to John, "is the Elijah who was to come." "For the law and the prophets were your instructers until John came; but since that time the reign of Heaven is announced."

John came to announce the Reign of Heaven. He was, therefore, spoken of as "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, and saying, Prepare a way for the Lord, make for him a straight passage. Let

* Matt. xxiii.—We will quote in this work from the New Version, unless in matters of criticism.

every valley be filled, every mountain and hill be levelled; let the crooked roads be made straight, and the rough ways smooth, that all flesh may see the Saviour sent of God."* "Indeed," says Jesus, "of all that were born of women, a greater (prophet) than John the Immerser has not arisen; yet the least (prophet) under the Reign of Heaven shall be greater than he." Since the time that John came announcing the Reign, "the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence," permits of great and courageous exertions, "and invaders take possession of it by force." Moral cowards cannot force themselves through the ranks of scribes and rulers, who will neither enter themselves, nor, if they can by contumely and persecution, will they permit those to enter who are disposed to enter. None but the morally brave and bold can invade the city, and therefore the timorous, indolent, and worldly minded, will be vanquished by those whose interest it is to prevent their entrance into the kingdom of heaven.

But as John was the announcer of the approaching reign, it will be instructive to form an intimate acquaintance with his spirit, temper, and behaviour.

As a man, he was humble, self-denied, and abstemious. As a teacher, he was clear, forcible, bold, and severe. While mild, conciliatory, and accessible to the sincere and inquisitive, he was inflexible, unaccommodating, and unyielding to the prejudices of the times. He was no respecter of persons. He reproved civil and ecclesiastical potentates, commanded a general reformation of manners, refused the proud, supercilious, and self-righteous; and adapted his teaching to the capacities and apprehensions of his audience.

His great prototype, in whose spirit and power he came, was Elijah. No twin-brothers were more alike in person or in countenance, than were Elijah and John in spirit and energy. I speak not of the many remarkable coincidences in their history, but of their spirit and behaviour.

These coincidences were very striking. Elijah lived much in the wilderness, and frequented the Jordan: so did John. There the ravens fed Elijah, and there the locusts and the bees ministered to John. Elijah divided the waters of the Jordan with his mantle, and walked in its channel; there, too, stood John, and often divided the stream with his own person and that of the reforming Jew. Elijah was called the troubler of Israel by the court party, and was banished; John troubled the courtiers in his day, and was imprisoned. Elijah reproved kings for their crimes, and John rebuked Herod for his enormities. Zealous for the honor of the God of Israel; bold, fearless, and indefatigable in his service; affable and conciliatory to the humble and the docile; but sharp, fierce, and unsparing in his opposition to the corrupters of the people, was Elijah; such a spirit actuated John. Irresistible was the power of Elijah, and irresistible was the energy of John. There was an air of severity in their reproofs, and unsparing keenness and sharpness in their addresses, which frowned down all opposition. They both set their faces like a flint against iniquity and

* Luke. iii.

hypocrisy, and made no truce with the corruptions of men. But as the name *John* imported *the favor* of God, and *Elijah, the power* of God or the mighty Lord; so John specially declared the favor of God to the reforming, and Elijah his indignation against the rebellious. They were both reformers, of one spirit, and of the same people, though in different periods of their history.

Such have ever been the prominent traits of character, the temper, and spirit of all real and useful reformers. Great moral courage, boldness, independence of mind, untiring zeal for the glory of the Lord, and unaffected benevolence for men, are essential to a reformer. The man who faints at the sight of blood will make a puny soldier, and a worse general. He that wants nerves to oppose errors can never reform them. One Luther was more puissant than a thousand Melancthons. Many who have the knowledge, possess not the boldness, nor the courage, to reform either men or manners. There are many, too, who have much courage, but they want information. The latter may be acquired, but seldom the former. A union of these is essential to a reformer. It is an arduous, and it is an invidious, and often a thankless work. But it must be done. All things are prone to deterioration, and if there were no reformations the world could not exist.

No reformers ever live to reap an earthly reward: perhaps we might except the political reformers, and these but seldom, and then but in part. If *fame* be a reward, (and what heart of man is unconscious of its charms?) I say, if fame be a reward, the reformer's fame and praise are almost universally posthumous. The righteous and venerable ancients, Paul says, obtained a good fame, a high reputation; but it was after they died. Death gives consecration to the labors, and life to the reputation of the reformer. He may rationally promise himself reproach, slander, persecution, or death, as the first fruits; but all that is desirable is in long and far distant reversion. No cotemporaries have, like posterity, eulogized or admired the great reformers of systems or of men. Some have had a taste, but only a taste of the reputation due to their wisdom or their labors. If Paul, Peter, Wickliffe, Luther, Milton, Locke, Newton, Franklin, Washington, were now to appear among us, they would find mankind very differently disposed towards them from those who were their companions in the journey of life. The Jews who railed against Moses, if the Lord had not hid his bones, would have worshipped them.

Those who would have been ashamed to have been seen in the company of Paul, now caress and honor him; and if he could appear among us, they would, until they got better acquainted with him, do him the same honors which the barbarians in Melita were willing to bestow, while they thought him a god in the likeness of man. Many who name churches after St. Paul and St. Peter, and dedicate them to them, and who quote them in these buildings as oracles, would, like the Priest and the Levite with their brother Jew, have passed them on the other side of the street. Many a *christian* Herod, no better than he who gave the head of the Harbinger to his daughter for a plaything, has execrated the Jewish Herod, and extolled the victim of one

less ferocious and licentious than himself. Few of us know what sort of spirits we possess. Many are now preaching and extolling Paul, who hate the persons most who are most like Paul in spirit and temper; and in the same sermon often admire and commend others, just because they differ from Paul. This is not so strange when we reflect that there are few who know the character which they venerate, nor that which they condemn. They detach one virtue, or one failing, real or imaginary, and through the microscope which prejudice or partiality furnishes, view the whole character. Hence it is that many are in love with they know not what, and despise they know not whom.

It is not uncommon for us to mistake living characters, and not less uncommon to mistake the characters of the dead. The Pauls of the Catholic, Protestant, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist *churches*, are very unlike Paul the Apostle. The Presbyterian Paul sprinkled infants and consecrated meeting-houses; the Episcopalian Paul was an Archbishop with a mitre and a surplice; the Catholic Paul always had a vial of holy water in his pocket, and a walking-cane made of the wood of the cross, and was always repeating prayers to the immaculate virgin; the Methodist Paul was President of a Conference of Clergy, and much addicted to sneezing and shouting, a great lover of camp-meetings, and excessively eccentric in his apparel; the Baptist Paul was a Bishop of four churches, and a friend of Saturday monthly meetings, and extremely fond of annual associations and advisory councils. I cannot enumerate how many Pauls nor how many peculiarities each possess; but one thing I know, that most of them differ as much from the Apostle Paul, as the statue of the Holy Virgin in St. Peter's Church, differs from the daughter of Eli, the wife of Joseph.

But, say many, 'What reformations are wanting—and to what extent? And, if any, who is to effect them—and by what means?' These are questions of great moment. To these we shall pay due regard. But in this article I intended no more than to lay before the mind of the reader the character of two of the greatest reformers in sacred history, actuated by the same spirit, not as if they were exclusively models, but because they give us, in the boldest relief, the most prominent traits essential to all who are public reformers. I do it, too, to correct that squeamishness of taste—delicate to a vice, which condemns as unchristian, as anti-evangelical, the clear, forcible, and pointed exhibition of error—the severe exposure of corruptions and the unsparing development of the schemes of pride, arrogance, and hypocrisy, which we know exist in our own generation. I thought of the Harbinger of the Messiah as likely to furnish us with one of the most appropriate models; not as if we, or any individual, stand in the same relation to society, or occupy the office which was peculiar to him; but as we learn the excellency of faith from Abraham, meekness from Moses, patience from the history of Job, and universal excellence from the character of Jesus; so we derive peculiar instruction from the character of John, because he was the pioneer and the precursor of the period called "the Reformation," or

"the Renovation," in the New Institution. While he prepared the way of the Lord, he reproved all the errors of the time, clearly developed the principles of reformation, and with a zeal, boldness, courage, faithfulness, and perseverance which was never surpassed except by him who was the founder of the New Institution. This shall be our model, sanctioned as it was by the great teacher sent from God, by the most distinguished of the Apostles and Prophets, and all the more illustrious servants of God in every period of the world.

If any, then, should condemn us because exhibiting, in their judgment, an *unchristian spirit*, let them do us and themselves the justice to examine the memoirs which both Testaments exhibit, especially *the New;* and whenever we fail in evincing the zeal, plainness, force, severity, mildness, and tenderness, which they displayed in accordance with the characters addressed, let them remind us of it, and we will desist, confess our error, and abandon it. But as at present advised, we shall, God willing, with all impartiality, fairness, boldness, and courage, reprove, exhort, beseech, and expostulate, until there is no longer need for these means;—always cultivating that benevolence, good will, and affection for them who love the truth and the God of truth; always cherishing that holy spirit, that peace of God, and unfeigned brotherly love, without which christianity is but a name, death terrible, and heaven unattainable. "The conqueror shall inherit all things; and I will be to him a God, and he shall be to me my son. But as for the cowards, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and prostitutes, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, their part shall be in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." EDITOR.

## MILLENNIUM—*No. I.*

ALL the promises do travail and are burthened with a glorious day of grace. The nations of this world are all to become the kingdoms of our King—they are all to submit to his government, and to feel the benign and blissful influences of his sceptre. This is the expectation of almost all the saints now living, as it was the expectation and the prayer of all those who have fallen asleep. The present essay proposes not to enter closely nor minutely into the development of the promises nor the prophecies relating to what is usually called "the Millennium." This we propose to do with great deliberation and with much detail. But we must approach it cautiously and gradually. We wish to discriminate and to draw the line accurately between what is certain and what is conjectural upon this subject. We shall, then, in the present essay, attend to the following items:—

1. We shall adduce a few testimonies from the holy oracles, warranting the expectation of the complete triumph of christianity over the whole world.

2. Offer some reasons why no sectarian establishment can admit of this spread and triumph of christianity; or why the foundation of no sect can be the basis of the Millennial Church.

3. Suggest the only foundation on which the Millennial Church can be reared. A few remarks on these topics, as introductory to further developments, is all we can at present propose.

1. That there is reason, clear, full and abundant, to justify the expectation that the reign of favor, or the government of Jesus Christ, shall embrace, under its most salutary influences, the whole human race, or that there are plain, literal, and unfigurative, as well as figurative and symbolic representations, in both Testaments, which authorize us to expect a very *general*, if not a *universal* spread of evangelical influences, so that the whole race of men, for a long period of time, shall bask in the rays, and rejoice in the vivifying power, of the Sun of Righteousness, the following passages, taken in their connexion, unequivocally declare.

Psalm lxxii. 8, 9, 10, speaking of David's Son, of him who was the *Root* and the *Offspring* of David, the Spirit saith, "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river (Euphrates) to the ends of the earth. They who dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him, and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the Isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and of Seba shall offer gifts; *yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him.*" Is. ii. 4. "And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more." Is. xi. 12. "And he shall set up an ensign for the nations; and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth." Daniel vi. 27. "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom; and all dominions shall serve and obey him." These are but a single cluster from the vines of Eshcol —a mere intimation of the blissful prospects which David, Isaiah, and Daniel open to us.

Paul, too, assures us, that "blindness in part happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles come in"—"for if the fall of the Jews were the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness! And so all Israel shall be saved.—For God hath shut up all for disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all." And John, after portraying the fall and utter ruin of Babylon, presents to us the binding of Satan, and all the kingdoms of the world doing homage to the King of kings for a thousand years. Yes, "*the little stone becomes a great mountain*, fills the whole earth, and the knowledge of the Lord *covers the whole earth* as the waters cover the channel of the sea." These unequivocal intimations warrant the sure and certain expectation of the universal spread and triumph of christianity. This much for the present, in proof of the first item.

2. Now for the second. There is no platform in any of the great sects of christendom on which to rear this glorious superstructure.

They are all *too narrow* and too weak. They are *too narrow*. The foundation on which every sect is reared, is a certain class of opinions, inferences, or deductions from the scripture premises, as they pretend, or what some call the *doctrines*, the *essential* doctrines of christianity.

We assume it for a principle, and when we are called to prove it, the proof is ready, scriptural, and rational; I say, we assume it for a principle, that the union of christians, and the destruction of sects, are indispensable prerequisites to the subjection of the world to the government of Jesus, and to the triumphant appearance of Christ's religion in the world. While the Army of the Faith is enlisted under so many different generals, and fighting under so many different ensigns, they may make havoc upon one another, but it is impossible they can convert the world.

General Calvin, with his ensign, and his standard-bearers, carrying and waving in the air his *five stars* over the heads of his troops, has been three hundred years in the field. And what has he achieved? General Arminius marched from Leyden about sixty years after him, with an ensign of a different color, marked with *five moons*. And what has he achieved? The two armies met for a pitched battle on the plains of Dort, A. D. 1618, and after skirmishing for a few days without coming to a general engagement, they drew their tents and marched. The captains and generals, the whole staff of General Arminius had been valiant, courageous, and daring as that of General Calvin, and they have been more successful in war. Various detachments from each grand army have mutinied against the commander in chief, and whole brigades have filed off under various brigadiers. And now, after fighting for almost three centuries, there is no more appearance of a general pacification than there was when they first displayed the flag. The christian armies are constantly fighting against each other; and while old Satan has managed to keep them fighting about grace and works—about rites, forms, and ceremonies—he has made vast levies, built fortresses, accumulated his munitions of war, until he is more invulnerable now than when General Luther began his march from Wittemberg, and raised his ensign against King Leo X.

The Prince of Darkness and the King of Saints have been, and still are, the two great moral belligerents. The Prince of Darkness has long commanded his troops in person; while the *King of Saints and Prince of Peace* has, for various reasons, some of which we can develope, entrusted the management of his affairs to different ranks of agents. Determined to achieve a glorious victory, he has permitted the battle to be fought by the weakest of his troops, and has armed them with a panoply, the only offensive weapon of which is *the sword of the Spirit*. The Prince of Darkness has been led into several ambuscades; and the greatest of all is that which is now in operation. But the army of the peace must be corrected of several great mistakes into which they have fallen, and must lay off the carnal panoply, in which they have fought with so little success against the common foe;

and must put on the *whole armor* of God before they can achieve one glorious victory. They have been fighting with *mercenary* troops, *hired* into the service, not from love to the King, but from love to the wages; and they have been fighting with straws in their hands, and scraps of paper covered with *pictured* opinions about the *modus operandi*, the theory of fighting. And worse than all, and most to be deplored, they have made war upon themselves, and fought against each other about the best mode of fighting the great antagonist.

Our King, when on the theatre of war, taught us a lesson which ought never to be forgotten. He said, "*By intestine broils any kingdom may be desolated, one family falling after another. Now if there be intestine broils in the kingdom of Satan, how can that kingdom subsist?*"* And, surely, none will refuse to add, upon principle and analogy, 'If there be intestine broils in the kingdom of Jesus, how can that kingdom subsist?' It cannot subsist. The kingdom of the clergy, or antichristian kingdom, has almost laid it desolate and in ruins.

*The sword of the Spirit* has been changed into *the Spirit of the sword;* a new weapon indeed! The troops fighting with the *Spirit of the sword* have become obstinate and inflated, until they cannot fight, except against their own commanders. They have thrown the *sword of the Spirit* away as imbecile and useless, and issued millions of *Spirits of the sword*, in the forms of missiles, designated *creeds* and *tracts*. Thrown into broils, and embittered against each other, their success is only in defeating one another. The kingdom of Jesus cannot subsist under this economy, and certainly cannot prove an efficient foe to the enemy of saints.

To drop the figurative, and to appear in the most literal garb. The platforms of the sects are *too narrow*. Few can unite upon them. A religion or a faith upon inferences, is an intellectual thing. It is an intellectual operation. It requires men to be well trained by logic and philosophy to make out a creed; and it requires just as much logic and philosophy to understand it, and to perceive that the inferences are well drawn. Few, therefore, can unite upon any one creed of opinions and inferences. The union that subsists in any one sect, built upon such inferences, is a union resolvable into ignorance and authority. I know so much of human nature as to authorize me to affirm that if any one sect, (say the Presbyterian for example,) were to invite their own people to examine their own creed, and to decide whether the inferences were fairly drawn, and then to insist upon an agreement in opinion, they would fall into a hundred sects in a short time. Almost every man who presumes to examine them, and assumes a little independence, becomes, in the estimation of his brethren, a heretic. They have, for the sake of peace, to keep their creed as much out of sight as possible, and to teach it without seeming to teach it.

I do not now object to the contents of any one of them, nor argue their merits or demerits. This I have finished long since. All I here say is, that they are *too narrow* to be the foundation of the *Christian*,

* Luke xi.

or, if any one pleases, the "*Millennial* Church." On no platform in christendom can larger societies exist than do already exist. They will, and they must, divide into smaller and smaller factions. Does not experience, does not the news of every day make this as evident as light itself? Instead of all the world becoming Quakers, the Quakers are falling into two parties; instead of all the world falling in upon John Wesley's platform, have not his followers fallen into two or three ranks? Behold the seven sects of Presbyterians, and the fourteen sects of Baptists! Why, then, pursue a scheme which every day proves abortive and insufficient?

But I said they were not only too narrow, but also *too weak*. The cords which an agreement in opinion furnishes cannot long hold together those who are bound by them only. They are too feeble. The cord of five strands, woven in the manufactories of Geneva or Leyden, is not strong enough to bind five men together who perfectly coincide in opinion, but differ in their interests. Let but a small gale of passion or pride swell the sails—away goes the cordage! Two Calvinists once in a familiar *tete-a-tete*, forcibly taught me this lesson. They had differed a little in opinion on one single point of the essentials of the system. A explained the matter to B's satisfaction. They coincided in this also. So soon as an agreement in opinion was expressed there was no more need for a word upon religion. After a silence of about a minute, "Well," said B, "who will be our next President—*Adams* or *Jackson?*" On this they did not agree. Their voices rose with the argument, and soon they became insolent to one another. Finally, says A, in an angry tone, "You Adamites and Hartford Convention folks ought to have a government for yourselves; I do not like to live among you. Good evening!"

Christianity presents other attractions—stronger cords than these. Its gravitating principle, when fairly developed, and clearly apprehended, is stronger than death; and its attractive powers can even rend the strong ties of natural affection.

All who belong to the popular systems are not governed by opinions only; nay, indeed, many of them love for the *truth's* sake; but I speak of the bonds of union as such, and with a design to show that any agreement in inferential reasonings, judgments, or opinions, oral or written, never can achieve what they propose; never can unite christians in the bonds of peace and affection. Potent are they to sever, rend, and alienate; but impotent to unite, harmonize, and cement christian society. Experiment and example are more convincing than theory; and will it not suffice to point to the schisms and factions that are rending the societies daily which are united in essential opinions, but divided in passion, pride, and taste, about a preacher, a meeting house, a wedding, or a christening party? All the platforms, all the foundations of the sects are, therefore, *too narrow and too weak* to sustain the Millennial Church; and, therefore, must be pulled down.

3. And this leads me to to the third item—and that is to inquire, What will be substituted in their stead? To this I answer, The belief

of gospel facts upon scripture evidence. If, upon any human scheme, creed, or platform the Millennial Church should be built, what would it be? Ask every sect, one by one, this question, and what answer will each present? Every one saith, "Upon mine; because, forsooth, nighest the scriptures." This answer is proof positive that it can never be accomplished on such grounds. It would be incomparably more easy to convert all the world to Jesus Christ than to John Calvin—or to any of the illustrious Johns. All christian sects acknowledge the same gospel facts. Every notable fact is so plain and evident from the record, that no one crediting the record can mistake the facts. When this matter comes fully to be developed, I hope to be able to evince that all the sects need to *circumcise their creeds*—to detach from them the mysteries of human origin—and when every sect shall have detached from its creed all that they learned from the founder of the creed or sect—they will find that nothing remains but the Bible.

But this is only talking after the manner of the sectaries. We never expect that the sects will have a meeting to agree on principles of union. Nor would we wish to see such a meeting on any sectarian principle. But we will attempt to show that there will be, or that there is now, a scheme of things presented, in what is called the *Ancient Gospel*, which is long enough, broad enough, strong enough for the whole superstructure called the Millennial Church—and that it will alone be the *instrument* of *converting* the whole human race, and of *uniting* all christians upon one and the same foundation.

This will not be the work of a single essay. To expose it, to sustain it, to fortify it against all attacks, will require much minute attention to the oracles, the human mind, the trains of reasoning, the systems of education under which infants are brought up, with the influences of the present systems, contravening, counteracting, and prostrating the great scheme called "*the wisdom and the power of God unto salvation.*"

If the gospel facts are all believed, and the authority of Jesus Christ regarded, we have every thing which christianity presents to redeem, save, purify, and happify the world.

To purge christianity, so called, of every thing extraneous, is more than half the work requisite to restore the ancient order of things. For as God has nothing better to propose to the world than what he proposed some 2000 years ago, all that the world needs to its happiness, and all that is necessary to bring us into the millennial enjoyments, will be to have the *ancient gospel* and the *ancient order of things* clearly, fully, and faithfully propounded to us. I know at least a thousand men so much improved by the ancient gospel, that all that is necessary to the enjoyment of the millennial glory and felicity, is to get a majority of society, or, if you please, mankind generally, as much under its influence as this thousand, in order to have glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good will among men.

EDITOR.

## BAPTIST STATISTICS.

IN Upper Canada there are 18 churches, 13 teachers. In the ecclesiastic year 1829, there were 112 converts immersed. Total amount of associated Baptists, 956. The average number converted by each teacher per annum, was 8 converts and a fraction over.

In New Brunswick 31 churches, 12 teachers, 103 converts; total 1414. Average converts per teacher per annum, 8 and a fraction.

In Nova Scotia 36 churches, 24 teachers, 358 converts; total 2255. Average converts per teacher per annum, 14 and a large fraction.

In Jamaica 14 churches, 8 teachers, 1875 converts; total 7340. Average converts per teacher, 238 and a fraction.

In the United States 4285 churches, 2857 teachers, 16,356 converts; total 292,862. Average converts per teacher per annum, 5 and a fraction.

In all the above territories, containing North American provinces, the United States, and the Island of Jamaica, there are 228 associations, 4384 churches, 2914 teachers, 18,804 converts, for the year 1829; total amount of members 304,827, giving an average per preacher per annum, of 6 converts and a fraction each.

I have taken the above data from the Baptist Tract and Youths' Magazine, No. 1, vol. 3, p. 28, 35. The compiler in giving the table from which I have gleaned those documents, says it presents the best data of the *associated* churches which he could obtain; but he represents it as being deficient and inaccurate in many respects, and more especially in the amount baptised per annum. Making all the allowances of this sort, and giving to it the additional number of converts, which he supposes to be due from the returns made, that is, to add 6000 converts to cover the defects in that column the most deficient, the number of converts for the year would be 24,804. In '28 it was reported at 29,031. Then for the year 1829 the number of converts for each preacher, say 3000 in all, would average 8 and a fraction.

### *Reflections on this Data.*

Here we have an array of the Associated Baptist forces in the field. No less than 1300 churches without regular and stated teachers, or overseers. Some radical deficiency, most unquestionably exists somewhere, when one phalanx of the antichristian kingdom, has 1300 churches unattended, unwatched-over, like a farm thrown out into the commons. I say of the *antichristian* kingdom, but I say so with a reference to the whole. For if the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Methodist, Baptist phalanxes, to go no farther, constitute the kingdom of Christ, then a kingdom divided into four great factions, is any thing but the christian kingdom. For the essential character of Christ's kingdom, is that it is a kingdom of peace, harmony, joy, righteousness, and a holy spirit. To say that a kingdom divided into four great factions, with rival interests, contending with, and crusading against each other, is a kingdom of righteousness, peace, joy, and a holy spirit, is of all contradictions the greatest.

Yet some men ask, What need of reformation? All is what it should be, or as near as is either practicable or desirable!! But of this in its own place. In the year 1829 the Baptist army had 1300 companies, without a captain; and yet it is reported by some of the superintendants as in good condition. The plan of raising officers is most certainly a bad one: for, with all the preaching, begging, college-building, and theological school founding, there is an increase of wants, and a greater deficit of officers increasing annually.

But in the next place, the officers are most miserable recruiters. With all the King's bounty, and the whole treasure of heaven to draw upon, and to propose, they can only in twelve months marching, piping, and proclaiming, enlist 8 converts a-piece, of all sorts, good, bad and indifferent! And yet the system is perfect! Yes, the system of preaching and recruiting, is a perfect one, and the scheme susceptible of no improvement!! The great Generalissimo must, then, have an overmatch for him, commanding the armies of the aliens! Yes, he that commands the ranks of the King's enemies is more wise in designing, more expert in manœuvring, more powerful in executing, than our Commander in Chief, or there is a falling off in his officers, some traitors in the camp, or some great failure in the arms and munitions of the holy war. No: if all the captains, brigadier generals, and subalterns of the whole Baptist army, were to unite, and, with one consent, declare their perfect, full, and entire conviction that their order of things was either rational, wise, and good, or that it was scriptural, according to the orders of the King and his Prime Ministers; believe them who might, I could not. If all the "Stars," "Luminaries," and meteors, in the Baptist heavens, should concentrate all their rays upon this subject, and magnify them a hundred fold, I could not be made to see it. The whole scheme is wrong, because it is not the scheme of heaven. They borrowed it from the Protestants, and they borrowed it from the mother of harlots, and she obtained it from the Red Dragon. But I am an innovator, a heretic, and any thing that is worse, because I lift up my voice and my pen against the abominations that I see every where. Yes, I see them—I see the disease and the remedy. I am unsound in the faith, because I will not patronize, aid, abet, and flatter, the spirit of "holy and benevolent enterprises," big with promise, whispered, trumpeted into the ear, but broken to the heart! Because I will not say to the tract, missionary, and the thousand societies with their presidents, managers, secretaries, and *treasurers*—aye, their *treasurers*, God bless you! They talk of converting the world—the pagan world, with such preachers, when with all the labors of centuries to prepare our own people a *christian people*—3000 preachers in *twelve* months can convert, *instrumentally*, if you will have it so, for the sake of orthodoxy, *sight* persons a-piece!! This is the paradox of paradoxes. No—the Lord has taught us by line upon line, by precept upon precept, example upon example, and experiment upon experiment, it will not do. And yet there is no need of reformation! I have been mild to a fault in my expositions of those schemes. I

have been almost silent upon the corruptions of the systems, and the system-builders. But now I must speak out. I must lay the axe to the root of this deadly Upas, which has brought the shadow of death over our land. The clergy have been Samsons in strength, while bringing to perfection the schemes which have palsied us, maimed us, bound and fettered the truth; omnipotent they are to enslave the understanding, and the conscience; but impotent to emancipate the mind from the power and dominion of sin, and the fear of death. The time has come, fully come, when the ancient gospel must be proclaimed, and the ancient order of things must be restored.

The above statistics of the most puissant society, the least apostate in our land, the most accessible to the truth, the most open to conviction, and the most reducible to the obedience of Christ, fully show, incontestibly prove, that the Baptist Society is in the wilderness. She cannot march—she has been forty years in performing the journey of forty days; and if this be the growth of the greenest tree in our forests, what shall we say, or what must we think of the others.

EDITOR.

## TRACTS—CONVERTING MEANS.

MUCH more is said in some of the periodicals of the utility and power of Tracts, than of the Holy Scriptures. Men are fond of their own devices; and praise their own works more than the works of God. Yet we must all confess that the works of God are incomparably superior to the works of art. Men may imitate, but never can equal, any work of God. There is one thing, too, that human art utterly fails in; it never can impart life. The leaves of an artificial rose shed no odors, nor does the artificial eglantine grow. The babes of art have eyes, but cannot see; they have ears, but cannot hear. A natural bird or flower excels all the artificials in the world. It is so with the word of God. His oracle has a life, a spirit, which never can be imparted to any thing human. The memoirs of Jesus Christ are in their connexion more powerful to convert the world, than the Alexandrian, Cambridge, and Edinburg Libraries, all combined in one. Some think that new modifications and arrangements of the Holy Oracles, are better than in their concrete state. But one might as well argue that to place the eyes in the place of the ears, and the teeth before the lips, would be more conducive to the comfort of man, than as located. God's work is perfect, and so is his written Oracle. We may apply it to particular persons, events, and occurrences; but it is the Word—it is the Oracle of the Almighty, which has the power.

In looking over the Report of the Tract Society, I see much glory is given to the scheme from the conversions ascribed to the Tracts. Does the Spirit of God accompany the Tracts rather than the Scriptures! But if conversions are proof of the utility of the Tracts, will they not prove the utility of the *Christian Baptist* to those persons who most oppose it. If I were to become a fool, as Paul said once he did, and, as a fool, boast to silence other boasters, I would say that the Tract

Society ought to patronize the Christian Baptist; for it has converted as many persons as the Tract Society, with all its complex machinery, since its commencement; taking their Reports as evidence in the case. I can furnish many authenticated cases. But I have not published them, except in some few instances correspondents themselves may have alluded to them.

Within the present winter I have heard of sundry conversions resulting from reading the Christian Baptist. While in Richmond I immersed one young man, a physician, who came a hundred miles to see me, in consequence of a few numbers of the Christian Baptist falling in his way. He had been the subject of religious feelings and convictions before he saw the Christian Baptist; but, like Nicodemus, he had not discerned the kingdom of God, nor entered into it, until the Christian Baptist opened his eyes.

The following narrative I prefer giving in the words of the writer. Brother *William Carman*, of Baltimore, who has been one of the most efficient agents in circulating the Christian Baptist, and who is well known in the city of Baltimore as supremely devoted to the religion of the New Testament—to works of piety and benevolence—made a trip to Philadelphia, I believe on special purpose to introduce the Baptist to some of his friends, and to obtain an agent for it in that city. He succeeded in introducing it there. When I read the following narrative it appeared to me that the subject of it was sent to Baltimore as a reward to brother Carman. I hope my brother Carman will excuse me for the liberty I take in giving this extract from his letter without first having solicited his consent:—

"A youth called at my house in the early part of December, who was born and raised in Philadelphia, and in the Roman Catholic Church. He received my address in Philadelphia; and on the Saturday preceding the first Lord's day he was in the city, he called upon me to be directed where the "New Testament Church" met for worship, saying that he had been told I could inform him. The inquiry being somewhat singular, my attention was arrested to the youth. He informed me he had been brought up a Catholic, and had not much frequented any other place of worship; that a man working in the printing office where he had been an apprentice, lent him the *Christian Baptist* two or three years ago. The contents of the work pleasing and interesting him much, he got one of the New Testaments of the *new translation*, published by you. This being so plain, he made it his particular study. He was led to the conclusion that if ever he should come into the neighborhood of a *New Testament Church*, he would be a member, as his views of the Saviour of sinners were the same as those of the disciples mentioned in the New Testament. In the week following I had several conversations with him; and on the third Lord's day after his coming to the city, he was immersed into the faith and received into the church. I have since asked him if he was not disappointed in what he expected of a New Testament Church after he had seen the brethren. He answered, "No." As our acquaintance with this youth increases, we become more delighted with

him. He is very modest and unassuming; very ready and consistent in answering all questions put to him.

"I am now fully possessed of my reward in getting the Christian Baptist introduced into Philadelphia. True, I had in my eye particularly my old friends the Baptists there; and here is one I should never have thought of; but he is a son of Adam. Let us go on without tiring. We shall reap consolation in this life for the good we do to our fellow-men."

Should not, then, the friends of the Tract Society patronize, and not (as some of them do) oppose the Christian Baptist as pernicious. I use this as an argument to them; and to them an argument derived from their own principles. But the Christian Baptist, it seems, in the above narrative, operated just in the way that I always designed it to operate; namely, to draw the attention of the world and the church to the Holy Scriptures—not to rest in it—not to take their lessons from it—not to place it in any higher office than in that of an *index* (☞) where two roads meet, to point to the Bible. It had the effect in this case, which I have known it to have in many others, of putting the question, Where shall I find a *New Testament Church?* Does any one of the Tracts do this? This will prove them whether *sectarian* or not. We judge the tree by its fruits for the want of a better rule. But to my foolish boasting again.

I will engage to furnish data as abundant of the *converting power* of the Christian Baptist, as the Tract Society can furnish in their behalf. Whenever they attempt to prove their authority or their utility from their success, they will not find me wanting in arguments of this sort. If they claim divine influences as the cause why their Tracts are so beneficial, I trust they will extend the same courtesy to the Christian Baptist, else they will do themselves no honor. I will only add, that if the Tract Society will circulate the Christian Baptist as fully and as efficiently as their own Tracts, I have no doubt, from the samples already received, but the converts will be increased manifold. Pardon me; I know you can. *You suffer fools gladly, yourselves being wise.* EDITOR.

---

*Eastport, Washington co. Maine, Feb.* 8, 1830.

MY DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL,

BY recurring to your list of subscribers, you will see the name of the unworthy individual who is the writer of these lines.

About a year and a half ago, I left the Province of Nova Scotia, and came to reside in the town of Eastport, where I became acquainted with our dear brother, F. W. E. and by his kindness I was favored with a perusal of your writings, of which I had no previous knowledge. When I first read some of the numbers of the Christian Baptist, I saw many things which I believed and admired—some that I disbelieved—and others, the truth of which I doubted.

As I had, for some years, been in quest of truth, I thought it would be nothing but reasonable that I should read the whole of your writings, before I made up my mind respecting the correctness or

absurdity of your sentiments. I accordingly obtained a copy of your works, through the agency of brother E. and have given them an attentive perusal; and I can assure you in the sincerity of my heart, that my present views of the christian religion are (in many respects) very different from what they were before I became acquainted with your writings; and I consider that my reading of them forms a *new epoch* in the history of my inquiries and efforts. I trust that I feel truly grateful to the Great Head of the Church for the light which I have received from him through your agency; and I am also greatly your debtor.

Wishing to see the "ancient order of things" established in this place, I have obtained the following names, to whom I wish you to send complete sets of the Millennial Harbinger, directed to the Post Office in this town.

Wishing you grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, I am, my dear brother, most respectfully yours—

W. W. A.

## REVIEW OF ELDER SAMUEL ROGERS' CIRCULAR.

—CONCLUDED —

SINCE the first number was written I received the "*Western Advocate*," published in Fayette county, Missouri, of the 6th February, containing a Review of this Circular, from the pen of brother *Thomas Thompson*, of Missouri. This Review, filling *nine columns of a super-royal sheet*, does ample justice to the Circular. It makes the injustice and perversity of the Circular much more striking than I had any design to do. As far as my sentiments are concerned, and as far as the *Christian Baptist* was quoted, brother Thompson has opened to the public, in a very ample and unanswerable manner, the depravity—the "*total depravity*" of the letter. After eight columns of specifications, the writer pertinently remarks—"Had brother *Campbell* never before believed in the doctrine of "human depravity," your letter might convince him that one, at least, was depraved: and" (ironically adds he) "I am not sure but that he may be convinced of the necessity of the *new birth*, if it would make people cease from *perverting*. He will also know that some way, other than the works of the law, must be devised, if you be saved: for the law saith, '*You shall not bear false testimony*,' &c. But how your letter could convince him that the Holy Spirit ever operated on you, prior to, or since believing, is a mystery to me; for it is *the Spirit of Truth*."

Brother Thompson has certainly convicted him before the public of having wrested, systematically wrested, the Christian Baptist in his quotations from it. This he does by quoting the context of the passages referred to in the Circular. But the injustice done to my words, and the most palpable perversions of them, though to me most grievous, because illustrative of the want of all christian candor; yet it is a slight matter in comparison of the liberty which he has taken with the Holy Oracles.

I concluded my Review in the last number, observing that, although I agreed with the two fundamental positions on which Mr. Rogers emphasized, yet I dissented from his proof of them. The positions as qualified in my last, are true; but the scriptures he quotes do not prove them.

That I may do him the greatest justice, I will give his proposition as afterwards drawn out by himself in his own words:—"The depravity of human nature, as represented in the Scriptures, is so great and universal, as to render it necessary that we should be visited by the supernatural operations of the Holy Spirit." I suppose he intends this as a substitute for "Whatever is good and holy in man is of God, and HE deserves the praise of it." We shall take it as he has drawn it out. We shall now refer to his proof. It is Gen. vi. 5. Rom. iii. 10, 11, 12—18. Jer. xvii. 9. Psalm. x. 13. Eph. ii. 1. John ii. 44. xiv. 17. viii. 43. Jer. vi. 10. Rom. viii. 3—not one of which proves his position. He says, "*We are visited by the supernatural operations of the Holy Spirit.*" *I* believe so; so does he. But what *he* means is, that the Spirit of God, independent of the written word, and *without* it, changes the human mind, renovates or regenerates it. Does any one of the texts prove this position? I say again, *not one*. By no rules of grammar, logic, or common sense, can any one of them be so applied. I do most equivocally teach that we have been visited by the supernatural operations of the Holy Spirit. I appeal to the whole Oracle of God as proof of this; but he has a *private operation* of his own, and to prove his private operation he quotes these passages:—"There is none righteous: no, not one," &c. "Why do you not understand my speech? even because you cannot hear my word."

But to illustrate this still more clearly, I will select one of his strongest proofs: "*No man can come unto me except the Father which sent me draw him.*" Does he make the *Father's drawing* and the *Spirit's supernatural operation* the same? If so, he ought to have proved this before he compelled it to appear in his catalogue of proofs. But again, are all *drawings physical?* This he takes for granted. But no one will concede that all drawings are physical. For example, it is said that "Whitfield *drew* the people after him." Did he physically draw them? Did he literally draw them together with a sweepnet or a drag? Again, it is said, "Not the piety, but the eloquence of the orator, *drew* the people together." It is not once in *ten* times that *drawing* means physical or supernatural influences. How great must be the sophism, then, which takes for granted, that it always means *natural force*, or physical power. This is just what Mr. Rogers assumes in unceremoniously applying it to prove his private supernatural or physical drawings.

Unless the Father had, by his ancient prophets, and by the attestations which the Holy Spirit gave in the works which Jesus wrought; unless these draw the attention and captivate the hearts of men, I know no one can come to Jesus as the Messiah, the only begotten Son of God, and Saviour of the world.

Do we not see that the disciples of *Robert Owen*, and all the sceptics of every school, who reject the operations of the Holy Spirit, who do not accredit the testimony of the prophets, the works which God wrought, do not, cannot, come to Jesus, other than as the son of Joseph. Not one now living, and not one of those dead, who have rejected the attestations given from Heaven by the Father, and carried down by the Holy Spirit, can receive Jesus as God's only Son. I say, not one in ancient or modern times could receive Jesus, merely upon his own testimony, as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world.

Must I thus, one by one, expose a hundred perversions of Scripture words and phrases, for the sake of proving what must be plain as light to all who *will* see that Mr. Rogers, whatever may be his gifts and talents, is not to be trusted as an expounder or teacher of the Holy Writings. I do most cordially pity those human beings who are looking to him for instruction. "If the blind lead the blind, both must fall into the ditch." I am afraid I have quoted these last words more pertinently than any sentence quoted in his Circular.

But he seems as incapable of quoting my words and applying them correctly, as he does the words of the Apostles. So much so, that in no one instance, has he ever permitted me to speak my own sentiments, as the reader may see by turning over to all the passages quoted from the Christian Baptist, and reading them in their proper connexions. Whether to ascribe this to design or incapacity, I presume not. But I must caution the public, as far as these pages go, against such applications of Scriptures. It is of little consequence how he misapplies my words; but not so to them who look to him for information from the Scriptures. For their sakes I will exhibit a few specimens, which otherwise I should not with any reference to myself.

Paul, in his letter to the Ephesians, (i. 20.) prays for the disciples in Ephesus, that they might know the hope of God's calling, and the riches of the glory of God's inheritance among the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of God's power toward them who believe, (to be displayed in the resurrection and immortality of their bodies,) according to the working of his great power which he wrought on Christ's body when he raised him from the dead and placed him at his own right hand. This Mr. Rogers expounds, and applies to the production of faith in the mind!!

Luke tells us that among the pious women who met for social worship, Lydia was one. God had opened her heart, being taught by his prophets, so that she heard and received the testimony of Paul concerning Jesus, and was immersed, herself and family. Mr. Rogers applies this to "the first spiritual emotion," the physical opening of the heart in unregenerated and untaught persons!! though, for aught he knows, Lydia had been taught by God's prophets years before!

Again, it is written, that "to as many as received Jesus, he gave power to become the sons of God, *even to them that believe on his name;* which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." From this he infers that they were born of God before they believed on his name!

"God," says Paul, speaking of himself and his fellow-Apostles, "who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into *our hearts*, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." This Mr. Rogers applies to himself and his associates!!! Poor man! he is sadly abused by Mr. Fuller and other Rabbis, to whom he looks for light, rather than to the Apostles. I must turn him over to his brother Thomas Thompson, of Missouri, who I see is well qualified to instruct him.

But before dismissing him and his perversions of scripture and of the Christian Baptist, I must take some notice of his logical displays. After informing his brethren of the Missouri country, that, because the word of God is called "*the sword of the Spirit*," and "*a hammer which breaketh the rock in pieces*," he proceeds to prove the utter impossibility of the word of God effecting any thing unless wielded by the author of it. He presumes that because it is called "*the sword of the Spirit*," that it will only pierce the heart when grasped by the hand of its author. This is his reasoning from analogy. Now, forgetting, as far as possible for the time being, his divinity, let us notice this new logic. He supposes that a sword will be inefficient in any hand, save that of its maker. This is his data. Now who needs to be informed that a sword will kill just as effectually in any strong and valiant man's hand, as in the hand of its maker? Many a person can do more execution with a sword, or with a hammer, than the artificer who made it. Paoceeding upon the hypothesis that the sword, or the hammer, is useless save in the hands of the artists who made it, his reasonings and his conclusions must be as fallacious as his expositions of the scriptures. I think he saw his error here; for he fears the conclusion, and retreats in these words:—"A sword is particularly adapted for the purpose it is intended; that is, to slay the enemy; but an innocent, harmless instrument, unless wielded by the General." Yes, by the *General!* In the hands of a private, serjeant, captain, major, colonel, "it is innocent and harmless;" but in the hands of the *General* it is powerful! "So is the sword of the Spirit," says he. "When wielded by the *Almighty Agent*, it produces marvellous and astonishing effects." But in the hands of any other agent it is as innocent and as harmless as a sword in the hands of the Captain or Colonel!! . So the hammer can break no stone but in the hands of the blacksmith! Such a reasoner is Mr. Samuel Rogers of Missouri.

Yet he presumes to act the philosopher! He adds, "The great error, we apprehend, of the system we oppose relative to faith, consists in their excluding from the nature of faith the idea of approbation." Andrew Fuller said "THEIR *excluding*," and who Mr. Rogers means I know not. "Faith," continues our metaphysician, "includes a cordial approbation and voluntary reception of the method of salvation." Faith includes the idea of approbation? Why not add, of love, hope, fear, joy, peace? I have never affirmed nor denied any thing about approbation or disapprobation in respect of faith. But as Fuller's *Strictures on Sandemanianism* were before Mr. Rogers when writing

this letter, he thought he must apply it all to me at any rate. But I will inform him now that I have no objections to appending to faith approbation, experience, peace, hope, love, joy, &c. &c. and I cannot value his faith very highly, because, as far as yet appears to me, it does not include these ideas in it. Yet if any ask me, Are faith and love, faith and hope, faith and approbation, one and the same thing? I will, as a christian, and as a grammarian, answer, No. Faith has no more of the idea of love, or approbation, or fear, or joy *in it*, than my eye has my ear in it. Yet I ascribe no value to any faith disconnected from approbation and disapprobation, hope, fear, joy, peace, love, &c. These untaught and unteachable metaphysicians—these would-be philosophers and reasoners, are the most incurable drivellers in the world:—

> *"A little learning is a dangerous thing;*
> *Drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring:*
> *For little draughts intoxicate the brain,*
> *But drinking largely will sober you again."*

I thought every schoolboy had these verses by heart. O that modesty were preached a little more, and speculation a little less!

Tell me nothing about the *mere assent* or the *mere exercise* of the understanding, without regard to the disposition of the heart; about a *bare belief of the bare truth.* When I proclaim the gospel, I call upon men to obey from the heart; and if I hear any man suggesting his philosophic doubts, his *assent of the head*, or his disposition of the heart, I say to him, 'Obey the gospel; come to the Saviour; put yourself under his guidance; reform and be baptized, and bring forth fruits worthy of reformation.'

I will join any christian in opposing Sandemanianism and Fullerism as two of the most desolating *isms* in the religious world. They have inflated the minds and paralyzed the energies of their admirers. If I had nothing better to propose to mankind than such speculations, I would never solicit a hearing, nor condemn those who are always entertaining their hearers with their dreams and conceits.

The system which extols human powers, and that which debases them, take different routes it is true, but lead to doing nothing. Tell *A* that he can believe, and he will tell you he will believe when it suits him. Tell *B* that he cannot believe, and he will reply, 'Then I will not try.' Tell *A* that faith is the bare belief of the bare testimony, and he will say, 'That is very obvious.' Tell *B* that it is the approbation of the heart, and he replies, 'I do not doubt it;' and there it ends.

It is only when I see such system-builders, or rather such system-repairers as Mr. Rogers, turning the ears of the people to fables from the truth, that I pay any regard to them; and then only to undeceive them. For if one essay would establish the opposite theory, and cause men to assent to it, and rest in it, I should not write it. I will never substitute any theory for the Rock of Salvation. There will many, I fear, be found on the left hand of the Judge in the awful and glorious day of the Lord, who were Fullerites, Sandemanians, Calvinists, Lutherans, Arminians, &c. who were orthodox in the estima-

tion of their respective brethren; but not one of those who believed and obeyed the gospel will stand among them. When, however, I see any man repairing an old theory, laying up a few bricks on the decaying and dilapidating walls of Babylon, I find it my duty, especially when two or three Doctors of Divinity encourage him, to fire a single gun, and to disperse the Babel repairers. I have one now prepared and levelled for the Fullerites, and when I see it my duty I will apply the match. In the mean time if any man will point me to a stone in the Missouri Circular which is not thrown down, I will show him the other side of it. It will, I may add, give much pleasure to learn that Mr. Rogers has repented of the wrongs and of the injustice he has done the Bible, if he should never make reparation for his perversions of the Christian Baptist. EDITOR.

## SYMBOLIC AND PROPHETIC LANGUAGE.

TO understand *the language* of prophecy is one thing, and to understand *the prophecy* itself is another thing. It is, however, of primary importance that the language of prophecy should first be studied. To aid in this we shall offer some remarks and some extracts upon the symbols and imagery of prophecy. A vocabulary of symbols appears to many to be a desideratum. We shall, perhaps, furnish one of some sort, or, at least, an exposition of the principal symbols of prophecy. The following well written remarks, from the pen of Alexander Mc'Leod, of New York, are offered as introductory. This gentleman, in 1814, published a volume on prophecy, possessing very considerable merit. In this department of our labors, we shall avail ourselves of all the lights which have been thrown upon the prophecies, before we attempt to give a systematic and compact view of the great outlines, make a particular application of them to our own time. Our first attempt shall be to unfold the prophetic language, and to this the following extract is pertinent. ED. M. H.

"Every one who is acquainted with the writings of the prophets, has undoubtedly remarked that the expressions which they use are highly figurative. Some recent expositors have on this account pronounced the prophetic style one *sui generis*—a symbolic style radically distinct from every other species of composition. Dr. Johnston considers it as of this description, and distinguishes the hieroglyphic from the simple symbol.* I nevertheless am entirely unable to see either the necessity or the use, of considering the style in which the prophets wrote as essentially differing from that of every other part of the Bible, or of subjecting it to quite different rules of interpretation. The Oriental manner of expressing in general, and that of the sacred

*"There are two characters in this language. The one is uniformly called a hieroglyphic, and the other a symbol, in the Commentary. A hieroglyphic is a figure, made up of the assemblage of two or more parts into one picture. And a symbol is a single detached member." *Introd.* p. 4, *Commentary on the Revelation.*

scriptures in particular, abounds in splendid imagery; and the descriptive part of divine revelation is fully as figurative as the predictive. Nor can I at all admit that predictions are never delivered in plain alphabetical language. The truth is, the writings of the prophets, even in those parts in which the style is truly symbolical, are subject to the same rules of interpretation which obtain in all other writings. In every composition we find figurative language; and in several authors of our own age we find an abundant use of the metaphor. Both the metaphor and the hieroglyphic, are analogous to historical painting; and there is not a better test of the correctness of a metaphor than the one proposed by Dr. Blair, who in matters of criticism is excellent authority, namely, that we should try to form a picture of the several parts, and see how they correspond. It is not, however, to be denied that this figurative style requires, in order to be understood, a particular acquaintance with the several sources from which the principal part of its imagery is drawn. The earlier prophets selected their symbols from the well-known customs and arts of the Hebrews and the neighboring countries, Egypt and Chaldea. The writers of the New Testament join to these the customs of Greece and Rome. The principal sources from which the Apocalypse draws its imagery are the following, viz. The natural world; the history contained in the scriptures of the Old Testament; and the ecclesiastical polity of the Jews, including both the Temple service and the Synagogue.

It is obvious from these considerations, that in order to understand the phraseology of the book of Revelation, it is necessary not only to have contemplated with discernment the economy of the natural world, but moreover to be well versed in scripture history in connexion with profane, and to be familiarly acquainted with the ordinances of religious worship, as they were established in Judea.

Such attainments will qualify a man for understanding the *language* of the prophecy of this book; but much more is necessary to understand the *prophecy itself*, and be able to apply the prediction to its proper event. That event must be itself understood. A knowledge of true religion as differing from mere forms of godliness, from priestcraft, and superstition, and a due measure of acquaintance with history, civil and ecclesiastical, are indispensably necessary to him who would point out the accomplishment of the Apocalyptical predictions. We have, therefore, no reason to wonder that this book is not well understood in the Christian Church. No man is likely to make proficiency in any branch of knowledge without entering into the spirit of it; and it is impossible to enter into the spirit of the instruction communicated in this book, without such religious discrimination as will distinguish Christianity from the corrupt establishments of mere politicians.

Before I give you the rules of interpretation, I think it necessary to meet an objection made to the style of the prophecies upon the score of obscurity. It inevitably follows from the nature of the prophecy itself, and the character of the style in which it is delivered,

as already described, that it is not easily understood. While this fact is both admitted and accounted for, it affords a striking evidence of that wisdom which inspired the mind, and superintended the pen of the sacred writers: but we cannot admit that any sentence in this book is absolutely unintelligible, or that the phraseology is undeterminate. To a novice in the sciences, the expressions of the mathematician, the botanist, and the chymist, however, precise, will appear obscure; and may be supposed to be a language *sui generis*. But a proficient in these several studies will not complain of the obscurity of the style which philosophy finds it necessary to employ in the instruction of her pupils. It is not in obtaining a knowledge of the words, so much as in understanding the subject, that the difficulty lies, in respect either theology or any other science. The same observation will apply to the system of prophecy.

Absolute unintelligibility is not to be affirmed of any part of the Bible. This would be inconsistent with the wisdom and goodness of our heavenly instructer, because it would render such part entirely unprofitable. The scriptures are no further a revelation, than they are intelligible. *He that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men; for no man understandeth him. So likewise except ye utter words easy to be understood, ye shall speak unto the air. If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me. In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.** A revelation, nevertheless, designed for men of every capacity, of every nation, and of every age, must, from the nature of the case, prove to many, in any given age, in some instances, obscure. The Apostle Peter says of the epistles of his beloved brother Paul himself, notwithstanding his constant use of great plainness of speech, that *they contain some things hard to be understood.*† This also is the case with the prophetic part of scripture, independently of all peculiarity of phraseology. No simplicity of diction could render a prophecy completely intelligible in all its circumstances, even after its accomplishment, to a person otherwise entirely ignorant of the fact to which it referred; and much less are the prophecies which remain to be fulfilled, at the distance of ages, to be comprehended by those who previously have no idea of the subject of which they treat. Precisely for the same reason, a detached paragraph in the celebrated histories of Hume and Robertson, would appear unintelligible to a reader ignorant of the connexion, and utterly unacquainted with the era and the facts under contemplation."

## SCEPTICAL ENTHUSIASM—ANATOMY A CURE FOR RELIGION!

THERE never was, in any country, a race of such consummate philosophists, of such enthusiastic devotees to doubting, of such blind adorers of reason, and of such unreasonable reasoners against reason

*1 Cor. xiv. 1—19. †2 Peter iii. 16.

and faith, as these United States can at this time bring into the field. The foundations of all certainty are to be razed—I say, *all certainty*. The certainty of consciousness itself will not escape the general wreck. If any man say he is conscious that he exists, one of these philosophists, these rational renegadoes, asks him if he knows what he is—whether he is matter or idea—whether he has a soul, or whether he thinks at all—whether his thinking is not a mere conceit.—☞ *Thought is nothing more than the effluvia of matter organized in a particular way; odor is the effluvia of a rose, and thought the effluvia of organized flesh in bipeds of certain dimensions* ☜ But whether all creatures do, or do not think; are, or are not conscious; have, or have not faith; whether there is design, or not design in the universe; whether there is any thing to be feared, or loved; whether any thing that can fear or love; whether there is Creator or creature; whether all is mind or all is matter; whether there was a beginning, and whether there will be an end; or whether there is any existence or being at all, are yet in discussion, undecided among Free Inquirers. This is freedom and liberty worth admiring! All men who have any thing fixed or established are slaves, implicit believers, and under the shackles of superstition. If a man say he is certain of any thing, he has committed blasphemy against *free inquiry*, and is in danger of being bound hands and feet and delivered over to the clergy. I hoped that the light thrown on these subjects by *Robert Owen*, the father of the Free Inquirers, the *Magnus Apollo* of the doubting philosophers, in the Cincinnati Debate, would have irradiated the minds, or rather the thinking effluvia of these Free Inquirers; but all is silent as the grave on these lectures, and the Great Apostle of doubting is no longer quoted as far as meets my eye. Have they renounced him, and made unto themselves a new god—a male, or a *female* divinity?

The youth of this country are about to be inspired with the spirit of doubting; children will soon doubt they have any parents at all, or whether their parents have not sprung from them. Indeed, on the principles of Free Inquirers—(pardon the word *principles*—I do not know that they have one principle, save that *all things are doubtful*.) I was going to say, according to their *modus operandi* no child on the continent can be certain whether it has derived its being from any person, or whether it owes a single obligation to any human being—whether its alleged parents be not more dependent on it for comfort, and more obliged to it for their life, than it is to them.

Among the ludicrous and phantastic ebullitions of scepticism, is the following exhortation of Dr. Underhill, who recommends the study of *anatomy* as a cure against religious affections—a grand specific against superstition. Hear! hear! do hear the conclusion of his sermon on religious affections, printed at Steubenville, Ohio, 1829, and for sale at the *Hall of Science*, New York:—

"Awake to your true interest, my friends! Study your own frames! Let men, let women, let the young and the old, study anatomy and physiology. Why should they not? It cured me of superstition—it

may preserve you from it. It is a very delightful study—what can be more so? The history of our own bodies, of the various tissues composing them, of our nerves, blood vessels, organs of digestion, glandular secretions, optics or principles of seeing, &c. What subject can be more interesting? It is of every day use in all our avocations in life;—to men how important, and yet more important to women, in rearing the tender offspring important. And, may I tell you, the knowledge of anatomy would slacken the corset before it be laced, and spare you a thousand evils that flesh is heir to. It is the most important branch of natural philosophy that comes before us—it should be taught in all our schools—the child of three years old begins to study it successfully, and without fear handles human bones. I have noticed, with pleasure, the close attention you have given me—the deep interest with which you have listened; and I am induced to say, Be strong and take courage. Many of you are young, and may, if prudent in your habits, live many years. O then, form yourselves into schools of inquiry—spare a few moments from your novels, and season your minds with knowledge. In the dignity of your nature, rise from the narrow cells in which bigots would confine you to weep over fallen nature; and, regardless of the "flaming sword" held by priests, between yourselves and the Trees of Life and Knowledge, seize and eat, and live forever. You know evil, be ye partakers henceforth of good. Know your social relations—the nature of vegetables, the properties of matter—know cause and effect—know the susceptibility and peculiarities of human nature—and, knowing these, you may approach the thunder of a camp-meeting's artillery; you may enter the warmest circle, and witness the convulsions of ignorance immoveable and serene. Would you consider the advantages of these truths, survey mankind as they now are? Behold how small is the number, at this moment, who are not under the iron yoke of superstition. Behold the rivers of blood shed in the name of religion. The millions annually expended on idle, or worse than idle, teachers of sectarian animosity! the debased state of females, missionary infatuations, stripping of widows and children to evangelize the heathen; and the good these means might do in educating children rationally—and then say, is there not a cause why the scales of superstition should be removed?

"Secure to yourselves sound principles for moral conduct, for, without morality, none can be happy—you may doubt almost every thing, and yet be weak and vicious. Scepticism is good, if you possess the spirit of inquiry. A sceptic is a doubter; a doubter may be ignorant: but an enquirer will become wise—and the wise will be virtuous. A law is written in your minds—it is a knowledge of the consequences of actions.

"And now, disciples of free inquiry, farewell; I have spoken to you with freedom; have you heard and examined with candor? If so, my desires are fulfilled. May Charity and her twin-sister, holy Peace, be with you."

GLOSSARY OF THE LEADING PHRASES IN THE FOREGOING EXTRACT.

"*The dignity of your nature*," means, the dignity of your bones. "*Knowledge*," the science of doubting. "*Live for ever*," live till the worms eat you. "*Know your social relations*," know and respect the tobacco worm. "*The nature of vegetables*," particularly *cabbage* and missletoe. "*Be partakers of good*," revel like worms on a putrid carcase. "*Know cause and effect*," know that a *sensualist* always produces a Sceptic; and a Free Thinker always produces a free liver. "*Secure to yourselves sound principles of moral conduct*," disbelieve the existence of God, heaven, and hell; of rewards and punishments; reject the idea of responsibility; and consider morality as that which most conduces to the comfort of the *abdominal viscera*. Call marriage, *priestcraft;* chastity, *superstition;* and poligamy, *heaven.*

PARAPHRASE OF THE BENEDICTION.

"And now, disciples of free inquiry, follow *appetite* and *farewell.* I have spoken to you with *licentious freedom*—have you heard and examined with *sceptical candor?* If so, my *sceptical desires* are fulfilled. I am happy. Receive my benediction: May *Animal Magnetism* and her twin sister *Holy Stoicism*, be with you now and till you are turned into *cabbage* or *butterflies!*" EDITOR.

## AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

THE following well written communication from the Poughkeepsie Telegraph, New York, deserves notice. I think it is the duty of the Managers of the Bible Society to attend to it. Any official explanation removing the suspicious appearance of things, I will with pleasure publish. I do not wish to see this best of the enterprizes of this sectarian age, liable to such suspicions, and chargeable with malfeasance, misfeasance, or nonfeasance in realizing public expectation. Cannot the Managers render an annual report, as other public functionaries, well attested and documented, so as to render perfect satisfaction to the whole community? *Ed. M. H.*

### TO C. C. CUYLER, A. WELTON AND A. PERKINS.

GENTLEMEN—WE have perused your communication of the 30th ult. and shall give it such notice as it deserves. You take exceptions to being called a committee auxiliary to the American Bible Society, and impute it to our "ignorance" that we had not known better. When you came into the town of Clinton, begging for money, you put up printed bills with your names, and the single word "committee" attached to the same. You stated in those bills that your object was to "*aid* the American Bible Society." We considered the words *auxiliary* and *aid* of the same import, and so does Dr. Johnson in his dictionary. The expression, however, was not used by us with an unkind intention. We are plain farmers, who have been favored with but a common education, and eat our daily bread in the sweat of the face; therefore we cannot use the "enticing words of man's

wisdom," nor can we express our ideas in that polished language of which you are capable. Our sincere desire is to speak the words of truth and soberness, and to have our consciences void of offence towards God and man.

We still adhere to our former remarks respecting the sums stated at your Pleasant Plains meeting, that you desired to raise in the town of Clinton; we feel confident that we stated the truth, notwithstanding you assert that it is "not true;" and we do not hesitate to say, that our assertions can be fully substantiated by unimpeachable witnesses, who heard the observations alluded to. Your "minutes" prove nothing, because they may not be in the language then expressed; your object was to get all the money you could, be it ever so large a sum.

You are pleased to term the Bible Institution at New York the "cause of God." The first Baptist Society at Portsmouth, (N. H.] think otherwise; they have published to the world their solemn belief, that the Bible and other popular societies of the day, "are the work of an aspiring priesthood, aiming at the very annihilation of our civil and religious rights." As they are disinterested witnesses on this subject, their testimony to our minds far outweighs that of any who live by the craft, or partake of the gains of a plundered people, by being connected with these institutions. It should also be remembered that even the crusades were declared by the clergy to be the "cause of God;" yea, all christendom for ages has literally been converted into a field of blood, professedly in the "cause of God." The clergy have in all ages (and most wickedly we believe) used the name of the Almighty to enable themselves to obtain wealth and power.

In England we have a fair specimen of the effects of a well paid priesthood, and of the Bible and other popular societies of the day, which are so much desired by many in this land. There the clergy are so liberally provided for as either of you could possibly desire, and it is literally a land of Bibles and pious tracts. The revenue of the clergy of England and Wales is stated to be annually the enormous sum of thirty-three millions seven hundred and twenty-six dollars. The contributions to the Bible and kindred societies are stated to be two and a half millions of dollars yearly. The Bible Society of England alone has issued five millions of Bibles. With all these vast expenditures of money, what has been the result? True religion is fast falling into disrepute, and its influence is almost unfelt and unknown; the clergy themselves declare that the Roman Catholic religion and infidelity are rapidly gaining ground, and threaten to overrun that country. Depend upon it, gentlemen, that it is not all the silver and gold, nor Bible Societies, nor hireling priests in the universe combined, that can obtain that pearl of great price, the "grace of God that bringeth salvation" to the immortal soul. Instead of our "laboring under some strong delusion," as you say in your first communication, we solemnly fear that you are "blinded by the gold of this world."

We ask, by what authority you or any other set of men dare to ask for MONEY to promote the "cause of God?" Christ directed the young man to sell his property to give to the poor, and the Apostle made collection in the churches for the poor saints at Jerusalem: but no where in all the New Testament, can an instance be produced that either Christ or the Apostles required the people to give their MONEY, or make collections to assist in the promulgating the gospel. When our Saviour sent forth his disciples to preach, he furnished them with no MONEY, nor did he ever represent it as necessary to promote the kingdom of grace and righteousness on the earth. Whenever MONEY is made an auxiliary for promoting the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom, it becomes emphatically "the root of all evil," and the destruction of true piety, as experience has fully shown.

If Simon Magus had lived in the present age, we have little doubt but that he would become a president, life director, or agent of some of the fashionable Bible Societies of the present day, and would stand high in the estimation of the managers of those institutions. That we are not uncharitable, and do not censure without cause, we beg to state the following facts, which you will not deny. Last fall, a Mr. Davis, of Nashville, (Tenn.) was successful at *horse racing*, having won considerable sums; immediately Mr. Kingsley, (we believe president of a Bible Society) who is ever on the look-out for money, wrote him the following note:

"*Nashville, Oct.* 19, 1829.

WILLIAM C. DAVIS, ESQ.

*Sir*—Permit me to offer you my hearty congratulations for your success during the last weeks sport—while at the same time I solicit, in behalf of the American Bible Society, that you constitute yourself a member thereof, by a contribution of thirty dollars.

Very respectfully, ALPHA KINGSLEY."

Mr. Davis accordingly gives of his winning at the most immoral kind of gambling, and becomes a life member of the American Bible Society; if successful at horse-racing the next year, he will probably become a life director. If this is not encouraging gambling, and receiving the *wages of iniquity*, we know not what it is. Yet we are told (very profanely we believe) that a cause that descends to such acts to obtain MONEY, and rests upon such means of support, is the "*cause of God!*" How dare any one declare that a cause built up by such corrupt means is founded upon the rock Peter, which "the gates of hell shall never prevail against?" Unless the public discountenance such unwarrantable and anti-christian means to obtain MONEY, the name of christianity will become a by-word and a reproach throughout the land.

As to 800,000 families being destitute of the Bible in the United States, no one can believe it; even Mr. Brigham does not, for he wishes that a smaller number had been named. We think it will prove as the declaration made in 1827, that there were 1200 desti

tute families in Wayne county, in this state. An investigation was immediately made, and it was publicly stated in the newspapers, that after a careful inquiry they had "not been able to hear of a single family of white people, who are able to read, that are without a copy of the Holy Scriptures. Nor do we believe there are twenty-five families in the county who are without that good book." Thus one of the destitute calculations falls to the ground.

The greater the number of Bibles asked for, the greater is the sum of money to be demanded of the people. The distribution of the Bible, however, does no good without an interpreter, if the extract from a report of an Auxiliary Education Society, at Salem, (Mass.) be true, which is as follows: "Let Bible Societies translate the scriptures into every language, and spread them in every clime; and *they will usually be a dead letter, without ministers to expound them.*" According to this orthodox language, the Bible is a "dead letter" without priests are well paid and sent to "expound" it; or in other words, the people are not capable of reading and judging for themselves; this is precisely the language of the Roman Catholic priests. So after raising the money for 800,000 Bibles, the people have but just entered into the begging system. They must then contribute to educate 800,000 "indigent pious young men," and pay them liberal salaries to go and "expound" those Bibles, or they will be a "dead letter," and of no use. We shall then have "committees" swarming through our country, like the locusts of Egypt, sighing for money! money! money! Thus we see that the calls for money is hardly begun. Money (*the save-all*) must therefore be had, and in a continued stream; for these priests must be well paid, and have it during their lives, or they will not "expound" the Bible to the "poor, perishing heathen," and it will remain a "dead letter" in their hands, and consequently their souls will be lost forever! Now, we are of the opinion that this cause, its projectors and money, will all perish together; neither can we believe "that the mass of mankind have been born with saddles on their backs, and a favored few, booted and spurred, to ride them legitimately by the grace of God."

We frankly acknowledge that we were led into an error by the Christian Almanac, by its use of the word *income*, which we considered synonymous with the word *profit;* and we are advised by you to learn the "difference between the income and the profits of a firm or society." Now, with all due deference to your superior wisdom, we shall appeal from your own decision to a high authority that you cannot deny—to Dr. Noah Webster. He defines the word *income* to be, "that gain which proceeds from labor, business, or *profits of any kind.*" Therefore we say, on the authority of Dr. Webster, that the Christian Almanac is in the wrong, which led us to an erroneous conclusion. We regret it much, for God forbid that we should state any thing but the truth. We desire only to elicit facts respecting the application of the funds of the American Bible Society. We have hard work to get at them; for you will not voluntarily explain the

least thing, or go one step further into the subject than we push you, and although you liberally charge us with false statements, yet you do not give the public a view of the expenditures, so that every one can judge in the case for himself.

Our investigation thus far has not been wholly labor lost; for we have, with your consent, established the following facts: That the society, during the year ending the 1st of May last, received the sum of $143,184 33; that 191,974 Bibles and Testaments were *sold* for $73,688 88; and that 8,148 Bibles and Testaments were *given* away. You also admit that the society received the last year $17,985 44, towards gatuitously distributing the Bible to the destitute; and you say further, that the value of the Bibles and Testaments thus given away, is $3,636 78. According to your statement there is the sum of $14,348 66 *unaccounted for.* WE WISH TO BE INFORMED FOR WHAT THAT MONEY HAS BEEN EXPENDED. You say it is not on hand, that the treasury is not only empty, but $190 66 in debt. If the donations of individuals, to supply the destitute with Bibles, have been diverted from their original purpose, then there is some where a violation of good faith, a breach of trust, and great injustice has been done. It is evident that the money has been spent, and the "destitute" have thus been deprived of receiving their Bibles.

There are other sums of money which we desire information about; beside the absence of $14,348 66, out of one year's donations of $17,985 44, we wish also to learn what has become of the money received over and above the sums obtained for Bibles sold, and the cost of those given away. There was $143,184 33 received in the whole; of that sum $73,688 88 were for Bibles sold, and $3,636 78 were expended for Bibles given away, making together the sum of $77,325 66. Then there remained the sum of $65,858 67 *unaccounted for*, of the whole sum received. You will do us a kindness, gentlemen, and we have no doubt the public also, by informing us how this part of the funds have been applied, and for what expended. You say the money is gone out of the treasury; and, as two of you are managers of the Bible Society by the constitution, we presume that you can tell for what it has been used.

Gentlemen, you reproach us with being ignorant, and repeatedly call us fools; most gladly we would suffer as "fools for Christ's sake," if thereby we could come to the knowledge of truth as it is in him. We admitted that we did not know where the surplus funds of the Bible Society had gone; knowing then our ignorance, as honest men you should willingly have enlightened us. But instead thereof, your answer was in the "gall of bitterness;" and to us it was a matter of deep regret, that you should have violated the rules of common courtesy, and have lost sight even of self-respect. The spirit in which you wrote is far from being "gentle, easy to be entreated," and "that works by love and purifies the heart." "I write not these things to shame you, but, as my beloved sons, I warn you."

You have publicly thanked us, gentlemen, for "coming out," and courted investigation; in doing so, if you were sincere, you ought to applaud rather than censure us. Investigation and free inquiry never yet did harm; on the contrary, the truth is thereby established, and error exposed. We have lived long enough, however, to know, that invective is a miserable substitue for argument, and that is a bad cause that requires it. We know that we are engaged in a controversy in which there may be great prejudices raised against us—all that we ask is a fair hearing. We have entered into it with a firm determination, if it be possible, to come at the truth; and neither the frowns of the interested, the insults of the craftsmen, nor the contume of "spiritual wickedness in high places," shall drive us from our purpose.

Signed in behalf of those who called the Clinton town meeting,
ISAAC B. ALBERTSON, *Secretary.*

☞We had intended to bestow some little attention on the letter of "J. C. Brigham, Secretary of Domestic Correspondence of the American Bible Society," this week; but for want of time, have been obliged to defer it until next week.

*Republican Telegraph and Observer.*

## THE WORLD GOVERNED BY NAMES.

WHATEVER is written by a Presbyterian will be acceptable to Presbyterians, and whatever is written by an Episcopalian will generally be acceptable to Episcopalians. We are led by fashion and names, and the decisions of those we have decreed to be good judges. It is hard to tell what would have been the fate of many a book if it had come out under a different name, or emanated from a different pen. The following anecdote will teach a good lesson, and its moral is one which we could wish to see generally acquiesced in. It will apply to many other productions, and to many other characters, besides those which gave rise to it and figure in it. *Ed. M. H.*

*From the pen of William Cobbett.*

"That which never ought to have been forgotten by those who were men at the time, and that which ought to be *made known to every young man of the present age*, in order that he may be induced to exercise his own judgment with regard to books, is, the transactions relative to the writings of Shakespeare, which transactions took place about thirty years ago. It is said, (and it was then much more, the practice to extol every line of Shakespeare to the skies;) not to admire Shakespeare has been deemed a proof of want of understanding and taste. Mr. Garrick, and some others after him, had their own good and profitable reasons for crying up the works of this poet. When I was a very little boy, there was a *jubilee* in honor of Shakespeare; and he was stated to have planted a *mulberry tree:* boxes, and other little ornamental things in wood, were sold all over the country, as having been made out of the trunk or limbs of this ancient and sacred tree. We

Protestants laugh at the *relics* so highly prized by Catholics; but never was a Catholic people half so much duped by the relics of saints, as this nation was by a mulberry tree, of which, probably, more wood was sold than would have been sufficient in quantity to build a ship of war or a large house. This madness abated for some time, but towards the last century it broke out again with more fury than ever. Shakspeare's works were published by Boydell, an Alderman of London, at a subscription of *five hundred pounds for each copy;* accompanied by plates, each forming a large picture. Among the madmen of the day was a Mr. Ireland, who seemed to be more mad than any of the rest. His adoration of the poet led him to perform a pilgrimage to an old farm-house near Stratford upon Avon, said to have been the birth-place of the poet. Arrived at the spot, he requested the farmer and his wife to let him search the house for papers, *first going upon his knees*, and praying, in the poetic style, the gods to aid him in his quest. He found no papers; but he found that the farmer's wife in clearing out a garret some years before, had found some rubbishy old papers which she had *burnt*, and which had probably been papers used in the wrapping up of pigs' cheeks to keep them from the bats. "O! wretched woman!" exclaimed he, "do you know what you have done?" "O! dear, no!" said the woman, half frightened out of her wits—"no harm, no harm, I hope, for the papers were *very old;* I dare say as old as the house itself." This threw him into an additional degree of *excitement*, as it is now fashionably called; he raved, he stamped, he foamed, and at last quitted the house, covering the poor woman with every term of reproach; and hastening back to Stratford, took postchaise for London, to relate to his brother madmen the horrid sacrilege of this heathenish woman.—Unfortunately for Mr. Ireland, unfortunately for his learned brothers in the metropolis, and unfortunately for the reputation of Shakspeare, Mr. Ireland took with him to the scene of adoration, *a son, of about sixteen years of age*, who was articled to an attorney in London. The son was by no means so sharply bitten as the father; and upon returning to town he conceived the idea of *supplying the place of the invaluable papers* which the farm-house heathen had destroyed. He thought, and he thought rightly, that he should have little difficulty in writing plays *just like those of Shakspeare!* To get *paper* that should seem to have been made in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and *ink* that should give to writing the appearance of having the same age, was somewhat difficult; but both were overcome.

"Young Ireland was acquainted with the son of a bookseller, who dealt in *old books;* the blank leaves of these books supplied the young author with paper; and he found out the way of making proper ink for his purpose. To work he went; *wrote several plays*, some *love letters*, and other things; and having got a Bible, extant in the time of Shakspeare, he wrote *notes* in the margin. All these, together with *sonnets* in abundance, and other little detached pieces, he produced to his father, telling him he got them of a gentleman who had *made him swear that he would not divulge his name.* The father an-

nounced the invaluable discovery to the literary world; the literary world rushed to him; the manuscripts were regarded as genuine by the most grave and learned Doctors, some of whom (and among these were Drs. Parr and Warton) gave, *under their hands*, an opinion that the manuscripts *must have been written* by Shakspeare—for that *no other man in the world would have been capable of writing them.*

"Mr. Ireland opened a subscription, published these new and invaluable manuscripts at an enormous price; and preparations were instantly made for *performing one of the plays*, called Vortigern. Soon after the acting of the play, the indiscretion of the lad caused the secret to explode; and instantly those who had declared that he had written as well as Shakspeare, did every thing in their power to *destroy him!* The attorney drove him from his office; his father drove him from the house; and, in short, he was hunted down as if he he had been a malefactor of the worst description. The truth of this relation is undeniable; it is recorded in numberless books. The young man is, I believe, yet alive; and, in short, no man will question any one of these facts.

"After this, where is the man of sense who will be guided in these matters by fashion? Where is the man, who wishes not to be deluded, who will not, when he reads a book, *judge for himself?* After all these jubilees and pilgrimages; after Boydell's subscription of £500 for one single copy; after it had been deemed almost impiety to doubt of the genius of Shakspeare surpassing that of the rest of mankind; after he had been called the "*Immortal Bard*," as a matter of course, as we speak of Moses and Aaron, there having been but one of each in the world; after all this, there comes a lad of sixteen years of age, writes that which learned Doctors declare could have been written by no man but Shakspeare, and when it is discovered that this laughing boy is the real author, the Doctors turn round upon him, with all the newspapers, magazines, and reviews, and, of course, the public at their back, revile him as an *impostor;* and, under that odious name, hunt him out of society, and doom him to starve! This lesson, at any rate, has taught us—not to rely on the judgment of Doctors and other pretenders to literary superiority. Every young man when he takes up a book for the first time ought to remember this story; and, if he remember it, he will disregard fashion with regard to the book, and will pay little attention to the decision of those who call themselves critics."

## THE RULE OF LIFE OF THE COLUMBIAN STAR.

I KNOW not why it is that Mr. Brantly is so much attached to the present order of things, while complaining so much of its inefficiency, and why he should at one time talk as if friendly to a reformation, and at another exhort his readers to keep in the good old way, alluding to the way of their grandfathers, or ancestors for some two or three generations. A little light on this subject would be acceptable. We would thank him to say whether any reformation in the system of things is

necessary, and, if any, in how many particulars his reformation would consist.

A correspondent from Alabama has written five letters to the editor of the "Star," in vindication of the perfection of the Christian Lawgiver, as that great and perfect prophet and lawgiver, under whose government alone is the christian community. The controversy between him and Mr. Brantly was represented as about the *rule of life* for christians—Mr. Brantly vindicating the *Judaizers'* notion that the *law of Moses*, in some sense, or in some part. is the *rule of life* for christians; and the Alabamian correspondent, that the New Covenant of Jesus Christ furnishes the law of Christ, or christian's rule of life. I have not carefully read the correspondence, nor, perhaps, read it all; but from what I have read, I have no hesitation in saying, that Mr. Brantly has manifestly failed in the hands of his southern correspondent. I have noticed some of the most disingenuous looking turns and tricks of the law in getting out of the difficulties with which his correspondent had beset him.

The following assumptions are those from which Mr. Brantly argues in the numbers I have read:—

1. "Moses was a minister of the law, considered only as a covenant of works.

2. "Paul contends for the abolition of the law, so far as the obtaining of righteousness and life are concerned." Was it ever in force for obtaining righteousness unto eternal life? Prove that it was instituted for this purpose before you show that it was abolished in that respect. But Mr. Brantly will find this a hard task—as hard as to show that it was a *Covenant of Works*.

3. "Paul establishes the law as a "rule of life" for christians." If so, why do you not rule your life by it?

But passing by these obsolete and unfounded assumptions, I request the reader to examine the divinity and logic of the following extracts from a late "Star," dated February 20:—

"That some precepts of the Old Testament should be abrogated, and others remain in full force, seems to constitute the chief difficulty which embarrasses our correspondent, and the venerable minister whose authority he arrays against us. But have they extricated themselves from this difficulty, when they have taken the New Testament alone for their rule of life? Has that preacher, in the long course of his successful ministry, obediently observed the following New Testament prohibition once given to christian ministers: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles; and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not." Will it be said that this prohibition is not now in force? Such a reply will admit the principle, that a rule of life may be in force, notwithstanding it contains abrogated precepts.

"The argument which seems to be the chief strength of our correspondent's cause, is, that the law is not obligatory on Gentiles, because it was not given to them. If this argument be valid, the obligation of the greater part of the New Testament also, may be set aside. The commands given to Jews, Greeks, or Romans, are not obligatory

upon us who are neither Jews, nor Greeks, nor Romans. Would our correspondent thus trifle with that part of the Word of God which he himself acknowledges to be a rule of life to us? To make the New Testament our rule of life, we must compare our circumstances with the circumstances of those to whom the commands were given, and infer our obligations accordingly. Where the same relations exist, the same obligations exist. Precisely the same method must be adopted in learning duty from the Old Testament.

"The law and the prophets continued until John:" therefore, infers our aged minister, since the time of John they do not continue. If he will argue after the same manner from Romans v. 13. he will render to the law a higher honor than we have ever claimed for it. "For until the law, sin was in the world:" therefore, he must infer, that since the law there is no sin in the world. We have regarded the giving of the law as a memorable epoch; but we never imagined that it banished sin from the earth. To all those who can so hastily conclude that 'the use of the law is abolished,' we recommend the study of the following scripture: "We know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully; knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man; but for - - - - - - - any - - thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God." Tim. i. 8—11. We are here taught that the lawful use of the law is not abolished; and that the law condemns every thing which is contrary to the sound doctrine of the gospel. This could not be, if the law ceased to be a rule of duty, from the moment the gospel was introduced."

In the year 1816 we taught, and it has not yet been attempted, either logically or by scriptural authority, to be disproved, that, under the constitution of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, we are not under any part, or parcel of the law of Moses, *as such*, as a rule of life; at the same time cheerfully admitting that many precepts of the law were found in the New Institution. The illustration then used I have not, in fourteen years, seen any cause to amend. It was this: Under the English constitution and law these states once existed. After the Revolution new constitutions and laws were adopted and promulged. In the new governments many of the principles and laws of the old government were retained, and repromulged, but emanating from a new authority and adopted and enforced from new considerations. But who will say that the people of Pennsylvania, or Virginia, are under the English law as a rule of life, or under the English constitution as a form of government? Not in whole, nor in part, are they the rule and standard of our political rights or political morality. Neither is the law of Moses, in whole or in part, a rule of life to christians. He that finds an English law in our statutes, and thence argues that we are under the law of England, deserves as much credit for his logic and good sense as he that argues we are under the law of Moses as a rule of life, because he finds "thou shalt not covet" in the New Testament.

The first period of the above extract exhibits a difficulty of Mr. Brantly's own creation, which this illustration shows to be imaginative. It embarrasses no man who understands the subject. But Mr. Brantly's ingenuity in creating another embarrassment deserves some notice. He supposes the New Constitution to embrace the ministry of John, and every thing written by divine authority since the christian era, and makes his correspondent put himself under the whole ministry of John, and of the seventy disciples and twelve apostles, in order to embarrass him with this precept, "*Enter not a Samaritan city.*" This deserves a smile, rather than a reply. If Mr. Brantly thus expounds, and by such discrimination edifies his charge, I envy them not. From this, reader, he *logically* concludes that a rule of life may be in force notwithstanding it contains abregagated precepts! "Enter not a Samaritan city" is an abrogated precept of the christians rule of life!! Alas! for the times!

The second paragraph of the extract is still more luminous. In order to show that a law is obligatory upon them to whom it was never given—who were never under it—he supposes that because we are not Jews, Greeks, nor Romans, no part of the New Testament is obligatory; for it was given to Jews, Greeks, and Romans! Does he teach that the New Institution was given to Jews, Greeks, and Romans, *as such;* as the law of Moses was given to the seed of Abraham, as such? This he must do to give any pertinency to his method of bringing us Gentiles under the Jewish economy!!

But the third paragraph ascends still higher in the regions of sophistry:—"The law and the prophets were your instructers, or continued until John." In order to make them our instructers still, or to continue in force over us christians, he has recourse to this phrase: "For until the law sin was in the world." Therefore, there is no sin now—if the law and the prophets are not yet in force!! It is by this pun, or trick, he carries his argument with his readers! Now had there been the least similarity between the two sentences, we might have supposed that a weak head might have fallen into such a perversion without intending it. Had Paul said, '*Until the law sin was in the world, but since there is something else,*' then there would have been an analogy in the style. But this wanting, there is no excuse for the pun. The Saviour said, (*and I wish his word were treated with common civility,*) "The law and the prophets were your instructers until John; but *since whose time* the kingdom of heaven is announced, and every man presseth into it." Shall I insult the good sense of any reader by showing that these words plainly and unequivocally declare the cessation of the authority of the law and the prophets as the instructers of men since the reign of heaven was promulged! No, it is too plain to require a word. Will the reader please examine the conclusion of Malachi's prophecy, and see how he continues the law of Moses till John, or Elijah, should come.

But in consummation of the climax, he changes the question, and substitutes the abolition *of the use* of the law for the question of the continuance of the *law as a rule of life* to Christians, Jews, and

Gentiles. We are here taught, says he, that *the lawful use of the law* is not abolished! And who ever contended that the lawful use of the law was done away!!! When I meet with a Jew I use the law to convince him that Messiah was Jesus of Nazareth. Is not this one lawful use of the law? But is this the same as making the law of Moses a rule of life to christians!!

I do not discuss this question here. I have done this in the Christian Baptist repeatedly. [See vol. 1, No. 7, page 121, 2d ed.] I only notice it so far as to give a specimen of the biblical attainments and logical tact of one of our "Stars" of the first magnitude. He has made it my duty to take more notice of him than formerly. He is assiduous in his opposition to my course, and although I have been almost a silent observer of his management, I have not been insensible of his exertions to prejudice his readers against every effort to bring them out of the confusion and strife of the spiritual Babylon. He has been struggling to give a high sectarian character to the whole Baptist denomination, and to have a kind of editorial episcopacy over the whole corps of editors in every state of the union. I do not envy him any honor which he could obtain from such an ascendancy; but I know of nothing which could be more fatal to the best interests of the christian part of that community, than to see them succumb to the high church notions of sectarian eminence to which he directs them. EDITOR.

---

*From the Columbian Star.*

## "A SERIOUS CALCULATION.

"IT appears from the best information that we can obtain, that the number of baptisms in our denomination, in the United States, for the year 1829, was less by 10,000 than during 1828. The latter year witnessed the unusual accession to our churches of more than 30,000 baptized believers in the various portions of this country, whilst the year 1829 scarcely furnished 20,000. Great as was the increase in 1828, it will appear small in comparison of the rapid advance of population, and the vast numbers that remain destitute of saving knowledge. From the ordinary increase of churches, it is found that deaths and excommunications make a deduction of nearly 20 per cent. or one fifth of the whole number; so that an augmentation of 30,000, would leave a nett gain of about 24,000. Assuming 300,000 communicants as the basis of the calculation, it is a credible supposition that ONE MILLION of souls in addition to the actual number of communicants, comes annually within the scope of Baptist ministrations. Now, out of this ONE MILLION of unconverted among us, the most prosperous year of our history supplied no more than 30,000 brought hopefully to the knowledge of the truth. That is, 30 converts out of 1000 souls; which is but little more than one to forty. If the most prosperous year upon our annals shows so alarming a disproportion betwixt the numbers brought to the fold of Christ, and those who wander from his right ways, then we are left to infer, that ordinary times, the disparity is still more fearful, and

that under the common measure of increase for a given time, the baptized are to the unbaptized, as one to eighty! If our estimate be somewhat extended, it will conduct us to conclusions still more deplorable. Eighty to one, under any circumstances, is a dreadful presentation to the pious and feeling mind. The thought would be intensely painful, even though the inhabitants of heathen lands, had to be embraced in the calculation in order to create the disproportion. But when it is remembered that this 80 to 1—is an aggregate composed of our friends and neighbors; of our families and relations, and blood; and that these, the dearest on earth to us, make up the sad majority that lives *without God in the world*, we should be smitten with astonishment at our indifference. Whilst we slumber in the repose of inaction the work of destruction is going on. Whilst we wait in supiness to witness the copious effusions of the Divine Spirit, that Spirit is withheld, and precious thousands, victims of delusion, wanderers from God, loiterers and idlers in the Lord's vineyard, fall about us to rise no more.

"After all that appears to have been effected in the last few years, by the blessing of God on the labors of his people, yet the world and infidelity and sin grow faster than the church of Christ. Much is doing in the circulation of Bibles and Tracts, many sermons are preached weekly, but that copious measure of the Holy Spirit's influence, without which the gospel cannot gain universal prevalence, is yet withheld. Ought not this fact, which we apprehend is the same in reference to the progress of religion in other denominations, as well as our own, to awaken the inquiry among us, whether we are not called to exercise more faith, offer more fervent prayer, and labor more intensely for the salvation of souls? We rejoice to see by accounts which are published in our periodicals, that the Lord is granting seasons of refreshing from his presence to a good number of the churches. Let us all pray that it may become a universal blessing, and that 1830 may, indeed, be the beginning of a new era in the church of Christ."

There is no sentiment, no principle of action, or of inaction, more injurious to the spread and influences of christianity, than that which the editor of the "Columbian Star" inculcates in the preceding developement of his views. The inefficiency of "the ministry of reconciliation," as some call the proclaimers of this age, the great failure of what is called the gospel of Jesus Christ, and of all the Bibles, and Tracts, and Missionaries of the age—all, all is ascribed to the refusal or withholding of the effusions of the Divine Spirit. "*Why hast thou made me thus?*" "*Why hast thou not helped me.*" "*I know, Lord, that thou art an austere man, reaping where thou didst not sow, and gathering where thou didst not scatter.*" This is the meaning of Mr. Brantly's excuse for the confessed and manifest failure and inefficiency of the schemes, which he for so long a time has patronized and plead. He says as plainly as he dare avow it, that the failure of the whole scheme of things, fashionable and popular, is to be attributed to a failure on the part of Heaven! Like a preacher who not long since

addressed the Goshen Association, Va. Mr. Brantly is too candid. The preacher, by way of apology, perhaps, for himself and his brethren, for the cold times they had, said upon the stage, "God, my brethren, has as many christians here as he wills to have: and when we meet next year in our associated capacity, there will just be as many christians assembled and collected as God wishes to have." Such is the meaning, in effect, of Mr. Brantly's *salvo* for his scheme. He says, *to the praise of man*, "Much is doing in the circulation of Bibles and Tracts; many sermons are preached weekly; but that COPIOUS MEASURE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT'S INFLUENCE, *without which the gospel cannot gain universal prevalence*, IS YET WITHHELD." So then *copious measures* for *universal prevalence*, and *partial measures* for *partial prevalence*, is the doctrine of the "Star." Partial measures convert 1 to 80 of the Baptist population!

This is a *new* doctrine among the Baptists. It was formerly taught that the same amount of influence was necessary to one as to another, or that what was sufficient to convert one, was sufficient to convert another. But *copious* influences are necessary; perhaps, he meant *general*. Charity supposes this. Be it so: will it accord with the scripture—will it accord with experience to say, that the efficacy of the means in operation is owing to a failure of heavenly influences? And, if so, is not this failure in consequence of our *new inventions*, and *insufficient substitute* for the ancient gospel, and the ancient order of things?

To pray for better times will not do; to pray for *copious showers* of converting grace, though quite fashionable, has no countenance in the New Testament. Laborers are wanting. Pray the Lord of the harvest to send *laborers*—yes, LABORERS. It is the want of the old fashioned laborers, working with the old fashioned implements, which is felt. In the same proportion as the means advocated by the Star are augmented, in the same proportion, to use his own words, "infidelity and sin will grow faster than the church." He says they are now out-growing all the exertions of the age, and history informs us that in proportion as a certain order of priests and clergy increased, in the same degree did infidelity abound. And such is one of the most alarming signs of this time.

If all the churches in the world of the Baptist faith and order, were to go on as prosperously as Mr. Brantly's own church in Philadelphia, how long before the world would be converted? *Never will the present systems produce better fruit, nor more of it, than they have already produced.* The stream rises no higher than the fountain; and a priesthood, and a theory, and a worship, and an exhibition of christian morality, such as we now have, can never do more than it has done. Every thing finds its own level, and the popular schemes of this age are fast finding theirs. It is not, then, that we are straitened, or limited by God, but we are straitened in ourselves —we have woven the toils in which we are caught.

EDITOR.

## THE JUDAIZERS—*No. I.*

*Illustration of the 3d chapter of 2d Epistle to the Corinthians.*

THE judaizing spirits of this age are continually inculcating *the law of Moses* upon saints and sinners. There are even some in the 19th century who are "desirous of being teachers of the law, understanding not what they do allege, nor the things concerning which they so strongly affirm." Their hearts are not fully turned to the Lord; for if they were, Paul assures us the veil would be taken away—that veil which conceals from them the true meaning and design of the law. We invite the attention of all who are in dubiety or in darkness upon this subject, to the 3d chapter of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians. We have read and heard much discussion upon this section of the Epistle. I therefore present the following view of the chapter, or rather the argument itself, in terms circumlocutionary, but carrying out in detail the force of the argument. We take into one view as referring to the same subject, from the 17th verse of the 2d chapter to the end of 7th verse of the 4th chapter:—

"We are not like the many who adulterate the gospel of God; not like the false teacher in Corinth, with his associates, who are mixing their own imaginations and opinions about law with the glad tidings concerning the Messiah, which they do for the sake of gain; but we, from sincerity, yea, really from God, in the sight of God, speak concerning Christ. Do we, in thus speaking of our sincerity, begin again to recommend ourselves, or must I a second time recommend myself to you as an Apostle? Need I for that purpose, as some false teachers and other obscure persons, present to you letters of recommendation attesting my apostleship; or when leaving you must I carry letters of recommendation from you to others? I need no such letters. You are a copy of our letter of recommendation from Christ, the original of which is written upon our hearts, known and read of all men. You are shown publicly because you are the letter of Christ which we make use of. For by your conversion, and by your spiritual gifts, you are publicly shown to be a copy of Christ's letter of recommendation in my favor, given you by me, written not with ink, as the false teacher's letter was, but with the spirit of the living God, in characters not to be misinterpreted; not on tables of stone, as Moses' letter of recommendation to the Israelites was, but on fleshly tables of your hearts. Now a boasting of this kind, that you are a copy of our letter of recommendation, we have in the presence of God through Christ. I thus boast, not because I am able of myself to discover by my own reasoning any thing effectual for convincing unbelievers as from myself, but my fitness to convert mankind is from God; who, by inspiration and miraculous powers, has fitted me to be a minister of a new institution, not an institution of *letter*, but of *spirit*. For the institution of the letter, or law of Moses, killeth every sinner by its curse; but the institution of the spirit maketh alive every believer by its promises.

Now if the bringing down from the Mount the institution which inflicted death on every sinner, and which was imprinted upon stones in letters, was attended with such glory that the children of Israel could not look steadily on the face of Moses because of the temporary glory of his face, occasioned by his looking on the glory of God, which bright shining was soon to be abolished, in prefiguration of the abolition of the institution of the letter; is it not suitable that the *introduction* of the institution of the Spirit be much more attended with glory?

And if the introduction of the institution which brought condemnation upon its subjects clothed Moses with honor, much more doth the introduction of the institution which bringeth justification to its subjects, abound in honor to those who introduce it. For that, indeed, which was glorious, is, in this comparison, not glorious, because of the superexcellent glory. For if that which was temporary and is now abolished be glory, much more shall this institution which is *permanent*, remain in glory.

Wherefore, having such a persuasion that the Apostles, the ministers, or introducers of the gospel, are much superior to Moses in respect of their inspiration, we use much plainness of speech in our preaching; and do not, as Moses, put a veil on our face when preaching the gospel; for he proclaimed the law with a veil over his face, that the children of Israel might not look steadfastly to the end of that which is now abolished. Their minds were, indeed, blinded; for even to this day that very veil, at the reading of the old institution, remains. That which is abolished by Christ is not unveiled; but even at this day, when Moses is read, there is a veil upon their hearts; but whenever their heart shall turn to the Lord that veil will be taken away. Now that you may understand what I mean by the heart *turning to the Lord*, the Lord signifies the institution of the Spirit, of which we are the ministers or introducers—and where the Spirit of the Lord is there is freedom from the veil; and all we Apostles, with an unveiled face reflecting as mirrors, (reflecting the light from him and reflecting it upon you,) the glory of the Lord are transformed into the very image of the Sun of Righteousness, by a succession of glory coming upon our faces as from the Lord, the author of the institution of the Spirit.

Having, therefore, the introduction of this institution committed to us, as we have obtained supernatural aid, we do not falter nor flag through the difficulties in our way. We have commanded away the secrets of shame, not walking craftily, not dealing deceitfully with the gospel of God; but by fully and faithfully declaring the truth, recommending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. If, therefore, even our gospel be veiled, it is veiled by those perishing things with which the god of this idolatrous world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, in order that the light of the gospel which proceeds from the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, might not shine to them. This cupidous, lustful divinity, weaves a veil over the hearts of men, which prevents them from seeing and believing these glad tidings.

Now though we Apostles are the images of Christ, as he was an image of God, we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord; and we preach ourselves as your servants on account of Jesus. For this we are qualified. For God, who at the creation commanded light to shine out of darkness, has shined not upon our faces, but into our hearts—to give you not a corporeal light, but the light of the knowledge of the glory of God—not as it appeared in Moses' face, but as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ. But we Apostles who have this treasure are earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power of converting the world might be known to be God's, and not ours."

The above paraphrastic view of this section is substantially the same with that given by Macknight and sundry other distinguished critics and interpreters of the original.

The institution of favor differs from that of law in many essential points. The following are chief:—

1. In their ministration or introduction. The former was introduced by one minister, Moses; the latter, by many able ministers, the Apostles. The glory of Moses was external and temporary; the glory of the Apostles was spiritual and permanent. His was the glory of the face—theirs, of the heart.

2. In the subject on which they are inscribed. The former was imprinted upon stone—the latter upon the fleshly tables of the heart.

3. In their permanency. The former was to be temporary, to be abolished before the end of time—the latter to be permanent, never to be supplanted or substituted by another.

4. In their tendency. The former was letter, and *letter only*—the latter is spirit. They who served under the former served in the oldness of the letter—under the new they serve in a new spirit. The tendency of the former was to condemnation and death—the latter, to justification and life. Bondage and fear of death attended the former—liberty and hope attend the latter.

5. In their ultimate object. The former proposed a righteousness leading only to temporal prosperity, and the present life—the latter, a righteousness leading to, and issuing in, eternal life. The former never bestowed eternal life upon any citizen; for eternal life was not in it, but prospectively; the letter bestows eternal life upon every subject, upon every citizen living and dying under its influence.*

Notwithstanding these and other differences between the law of Moses and the new institution, some Christian Doctors teach that the old institution of letter is a *rule of life* to christians!

EDITOR.

## CONTRIBUTIONS
## *FOR THE SPREAD OF THE GOSPEL.*

*"NO where, in all the New Testament, can an instance be produced, that either Christ or the Apostles required the people to give their money or make collections to assist in the promulgation of the gospel."* In the

*See "Jewish Age," No. XII. C. B. vol. 7, p. 181.

76th page of this number the above sentence will be found. Now, although we are opposed to the whole monied scheme of converting the world, and to the hireling systems of the clergy, and to the eternal cravings of the insatiate appetite of the mammonite spirit of this age, which seems to have inspired all ranks and degrees of religious teachers; yet I cannot subscribe to the above assertion. In so many words it may be true that no such command can be adduced, but yet it is not true that the New Testament furnishes no authority for calling upon the citizens of Christ's kingdom for aid in promulging the glad tidings, or in teaching the christian religion. Paul received such aid, and *commanded* it. He *commanded* the taught to minister, to communicate to the teacher in all good things; and many allusions to this subject in the New Testament make it evident that some *lucre*—call it *filthy*, or what you please;—call it *money* or *cash;* call it *goods* or *chattels*, some contributions were made for those who devoted themselves to the proclamation of the word and teaching. There would have been no praise due to Paul for laboring with his own hands, if he had not a *right* to have been supported in proclaiming the gospel. Neither could he have exhorted the elders of the congregation in Ephesus to have followed his example if they had no right to any contribution. Paul, however, did receive aid from the Philippians more than once, and praised them for their liberality to him; and if he made himself poor in proclaiming the word, they who contributed to him in his poverty communicated to him as a preacher—and so of others. Peter shows that some contributions were attached to the overseer's office, else he could not have exhorted the bishops to take the office from a ready mind, and not for the sake of emolument. All who know either my course or my writings upon this subject, must know that I am opposed to the popular schemes on account of their mercenary proceedings and character, as well as on other accounts. But while opposing the abuses of the age, we must not run into the opposite extreme; or, in our haste to get out of Babylon, we must not run past Jerusalem. EDITOR.

## COPY OF A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THIS WORK.

*Shultz' Range, Va. Feb.* 2, 1830.

Dear Sir—I HOPED before this time to have sent you a copy of my theological challenge to Mr. Robert Owen and yourself, inasmuch as my religion differs from both of you. But the "*Correspondent*" has so often *suppressed* whatever it could neither answer nor refute, that it has finally *suppressed itself*, and therefore cannot make its appearance in that paper; while the boasted "Free Inquirer," owned and edited by Mr. Owen's son and Miss Wright, on finding my "Review of *Atheism*, *Deism*, and *Theism*," rather irrefutable, are for *suppressing* it altogether, except a few of the weakest paragraphs, which they have *perverted*.

But, as you mentioned in your note, that you were about issuing a larger magazine, and you are the first preacher of the gospel in the United States who has given the world cause to conclude that you

really believe in the DIVINE origin of your Bible, by daring to meet us sceptics in any public discussion, and even in your own papers, I have concluded to embrace your offer on the following conditions:—

1. If you refute whatever I can advance against the DIVINE origin of your Bible, then I will abandon my Theism and join your sect.

2. If you cannot answer and refute my objections, then you ought to join mine; but I will leave you to do as you please.

Will you be so kind as to inform me whether we agree upon the following theological and historical facts:—That there can be no *gospel* without the *law* or five books of Moses; or, at least, that the *cosmogony* of Moses is the foundation of your religion, as well as that of the Jews.

3. And then, how many falsehoods you will require me to prove against any author before you will consent to abandon him as *"a bad man?"*

As I have never read any of our sceptical philosophers, all my doubts and arguments have originated in my own mind, and shall make no reference to any thing from them.

I have received three paralytic strokes already, which have impaired my *speaking* and *reading*, as well as *hearing* and *seeing*, so that I have been long prepared for death; nor is there a single night that I retire to rest without being prepared to meet my Creator before morning.

Please to send me one of your new magazines. I must subscribe for it during the discussion at least.

With great respect, yours, &c.

C. SHULTZ.

*The Rev. A. Campbell.*

---

## REPLY TO MR. SHULTZ.

DEAR SIR—I WILL, with all cheerfulness, hear what you or any other sceptic has to offer *new* upon the subject of deism, theism, or general scepticism. But before I discuss any question with you or any other sceptic, I will make it a condition that you or he shall have read my Debate with Mr. Owen. This is absolutely necessary; for why should I examine the same objections a second time until the refutation which I have offered is considered? From the number of sceptics, theists, deists, &c. which have been convinced, fully convinced by that discussion, I doubt not but were you to read it with that honesty which you appear to possess, that many, if not all, of your objections would be removed. Till then I would call it a work of supererogation to discuss in any way any other objections. You will find, sir, in reading that work, that the christianity for which I plead is quite another thing from *sectarian* christianity, and you will also find that if the cosmogony of Moses was error and mistake throughout, the divine authenticity of christianity stands more firm and impregnable than the rock of Gibraltar.

Hoping you may reform and obey the gospel, I am, with all respect, your obedient servant.

A. CAMPBELL.

## THE RISE OF MONKERY.

"EGYPT, the fruitful parent of superstition, afforded the first example, strictly speaking, of the monastic life. Anthony, an illiterate youth of that country, in the time of Athanasius, distributed his patrimony, deserted his family and house, took up his residence among the tombs and in a ruined tower, and after a long and painful noviciate, at length advanced three days' journey into the desert, to the eastward of the Nile, where, discovering a lonely spot which possessed the advantages of shade and water, he fixed his last abode. His example and his lessons infected others, whose curiosity pursued him to the desert; and before he quitted life, which was prolonged to the term of a hundred and five years, he beheld a numerous progeny imitating his original. The prolific colonies of monks multiplied with rapid increase on the sands of Lybia, upon the rocks of Thebias, and the cities of the Nile. Even to the present day, the traveller may explore the ruins of fifty monasteries, which were planted to the south of Alexandria by the disciples of Anthony.

"Inflamed by the example of Anthony, a Syrian youth whose name was Hilarion, fixed his dreary abode on a sandy beach, between the sea and a morass, about seven miles from Gaza. The austere penance in which he persisted forty-eight years, diffused a similar enthusiasm, and innumerable monasteries were soon distributed over all Palestine. In the west, Martin of Torus, 'a soldier, a hermit, a bishop, and a saint,' founded a monastery near Poictiers, and thus introduced monastic institutions into France. His monks were mostly of noble families, and submitted to the greatest austerities both in food and raiment; and, such was the rapidity of their increase, that two thousand of them attended his funeral! In other countries they appear to have increased in a similar proportion, and the progress of monkery is said to have been not less rapid or less universal than that of Christianity itself. Every province, and at last every city in the empire, was filled with their increasing multitudes. The disciples of Anthony spread themselves beyond the tropic, over the christian empire of Ethiopia. The monastery of Bangor, in Flintshire, a few miles south of Wrexham, contained above two thousand monks, and from thence a numerous colony was dispersed among the Barbarians of Ireland; and Iona, one of the western isles of Scotland, which was planted by the Irish Monks, diffused over the northern regions a ray of science and superstition.

"The monastic institution was not confined to the male sex.—Females began about the same time to retire from the world, and dedicate themselves to solitude and devotion. The practice is alluded to in the earlier councils; but it is expressly ordained by the council of Carthage, A. D. 397, that orphan virgins shall be placed in a nunnery—and that the superior of the nunnery shall be approved by the bishop of the diocese. Widows, and children above six years of age, were admitted after a year's probation. They were strictly shut up in the monastery, and secluded from all worldly intercourse.—

They were neither allowed to go out, nor was any person permitted to come in unto them, nor even enter the church whither they went to worship, except the clergy of approved reputation, who were necessary to conduct the religious services. None was allowed to possess property, for among them all things were common. They served themselves or helped one another. They made their own clothes, which were white and plain woollen—the height of the cap or head-dress was restricted to an inch and two lines; they were tasked daily, but forbidden to work embroidery, or to bleach their garments, assume any ornaments, or accommodate themselves to any fashion which they might happen to see or hear of in the world. The means of correction and discipline were reproof and excommunication; but the latter consisted only in separation from public prayers, and from the common table at meals, and if these failed to reclaim the delinquent, recourse was had to flagellation.

"These unhappy exiles from social life, were impelled by the dark genius of superstition, to persuade themselves that every proselyte who entered the gates of a monastery, trod the steep and thorny path of eternal happiness. The popular monks, whose reputation was connected with the fame and success of the order, assiduously labored to multiply the number of their fellow-captives. They insinuated themselves into noble and opulent families, and the specious arts of flattery and seduction were employed to secure those proselytes, who might bestow wealth or dignity on the monastic profession. The lives of the monks were consumed in penance and solitude, undisturbed by the various occupations which fill the time and exercise the faculties of reasonable, active, and social beings. They passed their lives without personal attachments, among a crowd which had been formed by accident, and was detained in the same prison by force or prejudice. Their days were *professedly* employed in vocal or mental prayer: they assembled in the evening, and were awakened in the night for the public worship of the monastery; and to such a pitch was absurdity at length carried, that one class of them came ultimately to sink under the painful weight of crosses and chains, and their emaciated limbs were confined by collars, bracelets, gauntlets, and greaves of massy iron.

"The times of martyrdom were now passed, and of course that sort of courage and constancy could not be exerted; a method was therefore contrived of *voluntary* martyrdom, and persons of fanatical dispositions inflicted upon themselves as many pains and penalties as pagan cruelty had invented. They left parents, wives, children, friends, families, and fortunes; they retired from the world, obliged themselves to a single and solitary life, and allowed themselves no more food, raiment, and sleep, than would barely support life.—

"About the middle of the fourth century, GREGORY NANZIENZEN wrote a eulogy in praise of the monastic life, wherein he describes the manner in which it was practised at Nanzianzum. 'There are some,' says he, who loaded themselves with iron chains in order to bear down their bodies—who shut themselves up in cabins, and ap-

peared to nobody—who continued twenty days and twenty nights without eating, practising often the half of Jesus Christ's fast—another abstained entirely from speaking, not praising God except in thought—another passed whole years in a church, his hands extended, without sleeping, like an inanimate statue.'

"One of the most renowned examples of monkish penance that is upon record, is that of St. Symeon, a Syrian monk, who lived about the middle of the fifth century, and who is thought to have outstripped all those that preceded him. He is said to have lived thirty-six years on a pillar erected on the summit of a high mountain in Syria, whence he got the name of 'Symeon Stylites.' From his pillar, it is said, he never descended, unless to take possession of another; which he did four times, having in all occupied five of them. On his last pillar, which was loftier than any of the former, being sixty feet high and only three feet broad, he remained, according to report, fifteen years without intermission, summer and winter, day and night, exposed to all the inclemencies of the seasons, in a climate liable to great and sudden changes, from the most sultry heat to the most piercing cold. We are informed that he always stood—the breadth of his pillar not permitting him to lie down. He spent the day till three in the afternoon in meditation and prayer; from that time till sunset he harangued the people, who flocked to him from all countries—they were then dismissed with his benediction. He would on no account permit females to come within his precincts, not even his own mother, who is said through grief and mortification, in being refused admittance, to have died the third day after her arrival. In order to show how indefatigable he was in every thing that conduced to the glory of God and the good of mankind, he spent much time daily in the exemplary exercise of bowing so low as to make his forehead strike his toes, and so frequently, that one who went with Theodoret to see him, counted no fewer than twelve hundred and forty-four times, when, being more wearied in numbering than the saint was in performing, he gave over counting. He is said to have taken no food except on Sundays, and that all the last year of his life he stood on one leg only, the other having been rendered useless by an ulcer."

*Jones' Church History.*

---

"IF we oppose *reading* sermons, and especially when they are *borrowed* or *bought*, shall we countenance the mere *rehearsal* of them—by worse than plagiarists! It must be a painful thing to an intelligent man to hear young men, without improvement in any department of learning or knowledge—unacquainted with the truths of Divine Revelation, uninformed on all subjects, repeat sermons full of rich thought, expressed in appropriate and eloquent language. It looks like the efforts of a giant put forth by an infant. It is as if we should see young scions in nurseries, borne down by a weight of mature fruit. The practice is now carried to a shameful extent—and it ought to be exposed; the practice of committing to memory short sermons composed by others, and delivering them, with the profession, a profession

almost invariably implied in the first prayer, that they are extempore. We are not advocates for extemporaneous preaching; but we do object most solemnly against professing to do one thing, and doing another; and against doing what in its tendency leads to such pernicious consequences. We have ourselves heard eloquent sermons from young men who cannot spell correctly in two syllables; and who understand nothing even of the structure of a common English sentence. Nay, worse; we have heard Greek and Chaldaic quoted by a preacher who did not know a noun from a verb in his own nor any language. We guard our young men against this growing evil. Some early opportunity shall be selected for giving our readers a review of some of these fine discourses. According to this plan the country may be supplied with spiritual guides, 'manufactured,' not, indeed, in what some have been pleased to call a 'mill,' but in a much more summary way." *Religious Herald.*

## BLESSINGS OF SLAVERY.

IT appears that in the state of Kentucky, the owners of slaves, who are executed for crimes, receive pay for them from the state treasury, and that 68,000 dollars have already been paid for that object. In a late legislative debate, it appeared that there were in the state 160,000 slaves, and that they were owned by *one-fifth of the tax-paying whites;* and an effort was made to alter the law, so as to relieve the non-slaveholding whites from the odious tax, but without effect; so that those persons in Kentucky who are opposed to slavery, and own no slaves, are obliged to submit to be taxed to pay those slaveholders who have lost their slaves by public execution. *W. Intelligencer.*

## HORRID FANATICISM.

ON the 27th ult. Mrs. Lydia, wife of Henry Herkimen, of Exeter, Otsego county, put an end to the existence of her child, three months old, by cutting its throat with a razor, in such an effectual manner as almost to sever the head from the body. She has been deranged at intervals for nearly a year past; and her partial insanity is reported to have proceeded from a gloomy and desperate state of mind, occasioned by imagining herself a reprobate, and the sentence of perdition stamped on her eternal destiny. *N. Y. Baptist Repository.*

## MONTHLY RECEIPTS.

*From the following persons, 2 dollars each, for the Millennial Harbinger, viz:—D. Dejarnatc, White Chimneys, Va.—W. Tarr, J. Mendal, and Mrs. Frances Tarr, Wellsburg, Va.—J. D. Foot, Morgan, Ohio; J. D. Wolf, Vernon, Ohio; Mrs. Mary T. Graft, for R. Urick, and herself; J. Holdship & Son, for R. Barnes, Evansville, Indiana; Bishop S. Vandever, Anderson Court House; T. Thistle, Tumbleston, Md.*

☞ AGENTS for this work will please be particular in stating the names of persons from whom payment is received.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 3. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1830. Vol. 1.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## A DEMAND FOR JUSTICE FROM EDITORS IN GENERAL, AND MR. BRANTLY IN PARTICULAR.

OFTEN have I said, and often have I written, that *truth*, truth eternal and divine, is now, and long has been with me *the pearl of great price*. To her I will, with the blessing of God, sacrifice every thing. But on no altar will I offer her a victim. If I have lost sight of her, God who searcheth the hearts knows I have not done it intentionally. With my whole heart I have sought *the truth*, and I know that I have found it. Not all truth, but *the lifegiving truth* of Jesus. But I ask no man to take my word for it. Neither my devotion to the truth professed, the earnestness nor the industry with which I have sought it, the sacrifices which I have made in the pursuit of it, nor any aid supernatural which I have received in the discovery of the truth, shall ever be plead by me as a reason why any person should receive a single saying of mine upon my authority. Nor shall I plead the success which has attended my labors, the great revolution in sentiment, feeling, and practice, which is every day progressing, as a proof, or as any evidence of truths for which I am the humble advocate. No authority of great names, no authority of great success, no authority of great devotion, no authority but that of the Apostles and prophets shall ever be urged by me in proof of any proposition respecting the religion of Jesus Christ.

I have given my readers both sides of all controversies, my own side, so to speak, and the side of my opponents. If the Christian Baptist does not prove this proposition, it proves nothing. Few, if any, of the papers devoted to religion, have taken this course. He who has read only the Columbian Star can have no correct idea of a single question which I have discussed—of a single proposition which I have advanced; nay, he must have the most incorrect ideas of my writings. As soon could a Mussulman of the order of Omar discover the christian religion through the Koran, as a citizen of Georgia learn any thing of my views through the columns of the Columbian Star.

They who have some sectarian, or party cause to serve, must take this course. They dare take no other. It will never do to let people have both sides. It would ruin the whole concern. I will venture to predict that Mr. Brantly will not let his readers hear what I have to say in reply to Mr. Clopton: if he do I will acknow-

ledge that I am mistaken in my views of him. If he will fill as many columns with my replies as he does with his accusations, it will be the most impartial looking thing I have ever known him to do. At all events, I will permit my readers to hear both sides, and to judge for themselves. In the name of sacred justice—in the name of christian righteousness, I demand it of every christian editor who publishes any thing against my views, to let me speak to the people through their columns. This I ask not as a favor to me, nor as a favor to the truth, but I demand it as the decree of immutable justice—as a debt due to me as man, as a professor of the christian faith. If my arguments be puerile, be weak, be foolish, and unscriptural, let them appear, and they will call for no elaborate refutation.

One time I am represented as a Hercules, and the success attendant on my labors is attributed to some peculiar tact or talent for writing and speaking; at another time I am represented as a mere pigmy, as an impotent driveller who can write nothing worthy of reading or of hearing. Whatever weapon will most likely aid my opponents is seized with eagerness. I attribute whatever force is in my writings to the truth which is in them, the almighty truth. I claim no peculiar ability. I claim no extraordinary powers. I can only carry, and I know I can carry, an ordinary burden. I am at no pains to polish any thing I write, I have not time for it, I have not much taste for it. It only pleases a few, and it is the many who need instruction to whom I wish to speak plainly and forcibly. I will treat my opponents with all courtesy as gentlemen, if they profess to be such, or as christians if they will allow me to treat them as such. But here comes Mr. Clopton, let him speak for himself.

EDITOR.

---

*From the Columbian Star.*

## THE "SAYINGS" OF A. CAMPBELL EXAMINED.

CHARLOTTE COURT HOUSE, VA. FEB. 20, 1830.

*Dear Brother*—It will not be denied by those acquainted with the passing religious events of the day, that few men in this country, since the days of George Whitfield, have produced so much agitation in the religious community, as Alexander Campbell, of Brooke county, Va. And yet scarcely any two men professing to be teachers of biblical truth, have been more unlike in their religious sentiments. This difference, if my apprehension of it be correct, arises not so much from a disparity in the original constitution of their minds, as from that distinguishing grace of God, by which the one was made a signal benefactor to mankind, whilst the other seems to be the appointed instrument of disorganization and confusion. The difference betwixt them, is not like that between Luther and Melancthon; for these great reformers held the same fundamental doctrines. Nor is it like that between Dr. Gill and Andrew Fuller; for they, too, agreed in doctrines considered vitally important to the salvation of the soul. But, if I be not altogether under a misap-

prehension of Mr. Campbell's religious sentiments, the difference between him and Whitfield, resembles that between Saul of Tarsus and Paul the Apostle—or that between Lord Byron and Milton. The God of nature endued both Byron and Milton with extraordinary mental powers, but they viewed the revelation, which he has given, through optics vastly dissimilar. Perhaps it would not be doing violence to truth, to consider these two distinguished individuals, in connexion with the following words of our incarnate and adorable Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Luke x. 21.—"In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast *hid* these things from the *wise* and *prudent* and hast revealed them unto *babes:* even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Milton, though unequalled in mental endowments, wearing, without a rival, the wreath of poetic fame, was an eminent example of that childlike docility to which God *reveals* those things which are often hidden from the *wise* and *prudent.* Thus Whitfield also, though followed by thousands of admiring hearers, who were borne away while they listened to the charms of his matchless eloquence, was as remarkable for his *humility* as for his untiring zeal in the cause of the Redeemer. But, with all my partiality for the term *Baptist*, I cannot discover any thing like this *grace* or disposition, in the writings of Mr. Campbell. On the contrary, if I were called upon by the mandate of superior authority to name the man, who, above all others, in the bounds of my knowledge, excels in speaking and writing "great swelling words of vanity;" I should not hesitate a moment, to name Mr. Alexander Campbell.

In his extemporaneous sermons, Whitfield seems to have lost sight of *himself*, in the contemplation of the worth and danger of the immortal soul—the fulness of redemption in Christ—and the kingdom of ultimate glory. In the pulpit harangues of Mr. Campbell, the critic, the linguist, and the disputant, are prominent characters. From Whitfield's sermons, sinners often retired with fearful apprehensions of the wrath to come, and crying "*What must I do to be saved?*" From the exhibitions of Mr. Campbell, sinners retire in all the levity and sportiveness of theatrical spectators. Whitfield, seldom, if ever, failed to urge home upon his hearers the unchanging obligations of a violated law, and the consequent terrors of a sin-hating and sin-avenging God. Mr. Campbell seems to think, that he has discovered, in the abrogation of the Moral Law, a much shorter, easier, and safer way to the heavenly Canaan, than that leading by Mount Sinai. Whitfield believed, preached and maintained the fundamental doctrines, commonly called the doctrines of *grace*. Mr. Campbell is so averse to *these*, that, if I mistake not, the words *grace* and *repentance* are scrupulously excluded from the *new* translation of the Testament which he has published.

That the friends of *truth* may understand his views of *these* doctrines, I will quote, from a manuscript in my possession, the "*dicta*" (*or sayings*) of a certain Mr. J. C. a proselyte of Mr. Campbell's. In his preaching he declared, according to the testimony of the wri-

ter, who was present and heard him: 1st. That there had been no preaching of the gospel since the days of the Apostles. 2dly. That the people had been preached to from texts of Scripture, until they had been literally *preached* out of their *senses:* 3dly. That all the public speaking *now* necessary, was to *undo* what had already been done: 4thly. That *John Calvin taught as pure deism as was ever taught by Voltaire or Thomas Paine; and that this deism was taught in all the colleges in christendom:* 5htly. That all the faith that men could have in Christ, was *historical:* 6thly. That the words "*little* children" in the phrase, I write unto you little children (in the epistle of John,) are to be understood *literally.* I am aware that a teacher should not always be held responsible for the precise sentiments and words of his pupil. And I should not have quoted these extraordinary "dicta" (sayings) of Mr. J. C. as the sentiments of Mr. Campbell; if I were not fully persuaded that they are substantially maintained and published to the world by Mr. Campbell, in his *little* pamphlet *called* the Christian Baptist. Besides Mr. J. C. *modestly* declared in the presence of the same witness, that no two red cherries were more like each other, than *himself* and Alexander Campbell.

Now if these things and *many* others, which Mr. Campbell teaches, and which to *me* appear equally preposterous, be true; if this be the way to learn Christ and him crucified; if this be the faith once delivered to the saints; if these be the means by which the saints are to come to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; then do I confess before God and the world, that hitherto I have been, and am still, a stranger to the meaning of God's book. Nevertheless, if all the other *professed* ministers of Jesus Christ, except Mr. Campbell and his proselytes, be in this doleful condition, this worse than the Egyptian darkness; still the churches ought to understand, believe and practice *the truth. Let God be true: but every man a liar.* But on the contrary, if these be the mere *proselyting* "dicta" (sayings) of the *natural* man, though he may have been *immersed* in the name of the Lord Jesus; if they be the wild and incoherent deductions of the *carnal* mind, aspiring to pre-eminence—*to wealth* and fame; if consequently, they be found dangerous to those children who are liable to be tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the *sleight* of men, and *cunning* craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; then certainly the churches cannot too soon be apprized of the fact; they cannot too speedily take unto them the *whole* armour of God, that they may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done *all* to stand.

Paul in his last letter and his farewell address to Timothy, and as a reason for his preceding, and most solemn charge, says, "For the time will come when they will not endure *sound* doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the *truth*, and shall

be turned unto fables." It is probable that this prediction related primarily to some period during Timothy's life: but it may possibly apply with equal force to the day in which we live. It is very evident, that the Baptist churches both in England and America, though they have abundantly prospered in number and respectability, without the *extraordinary* light and aid of Mr. Campbell, have, if he teaches *sound* doctrine, been in darkness exceeding gross. It is my intention, therefore, to examine his writings, and especially his *little* pamphlet *called* the Christian Baptist, and by your permission, to publish in the *Star and Index* the result of my examination.

My opinion of the *New Translation* of the Testament which he has published with his appended glossary, is, that it is an elaborate *attempt* to adapt the humbling doctrine of the cross to the relish of the carnal mind. The fact, that, in this translation, the word immersion is inserted in lieu of baptism, and which, in the opinion of some Baptists, is a warrant for the truth and validity of all the rest, throws not a a particle of light on the subject in contest; but leaves the controversy between the Baptists and their opponents precisely where it found it. It is my design also to examine more particularly this translation. It is not improbable that these remarks, should Mr. Campbell read them, may excite his contemptuous smile, as though I intended, with a feeble straw, to pierce the scales of Leviathan. But if the God of truth should direct and bless the effort, I have no need to tremble at the gasconade of Goliath. Some of my brethren for whom I entertain the most cordial friendship, and with whom I have enjoyed sweet fellowship, have dissuaded me from this attempt. They think that it promises no good, but evil: that controversy is the life-blood of his cause: and that in it, like the salamander in fire, he will grow and thrive. But the same reasoning, if it may be considered such, would argue silence and submission in regard to all the errors which have ever crept into the church. Surely it will be admitted by all, except Mr. Campbell and his proselytes, that what we consider error, in regard to the ordinance of baptism, is like a drop of the ocean, in comparison of the new "*dogmas*" and "dicta" (sayings) which are now severing the bonds of union and fellowship between so many individuals and churches. If, therefore, the discussion of these matters should extend the knowledge of his sentiments, be it so. He boldly challenges contradiction. While his confirmed proselytes in "compassing sea and land" to make others, urge the truth and validity of his sentiments under the plausible plea that no one has been able to controvert them. In conformity to this plea, I say, if they be true, we ought to believe, and adopt them; but if they be untrue, we ought to prove them to be such. I wish to be understood distinctly, that it is not my intention to engage in a formal controversy with Mr. Campbell as did Messrs. Walker, M'Calla, and Owen. But I purpose to examine, calmly, and at my leisure, his writings, and to state my objections to what I consider inconsistent with truth, and of course evil in its tendency. If in doing this, my remarks should be characterized occasionally with a degree of animation, which some may consider

incompatible with meekness and the dignity of the cause which I am to support, I must beg them to read more carefully the Acts of the Apostles, and the succeeding Epistles, and the Revelation. Surely the Apostle cannot be supposed to violate his own injunctions and precepts when he *urges* upon the church at Philippi what they had, in all probability, heard from him more than once before; Philip iii. 2. "Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the *concision*."

I am constrained to beg my dear brethren to bear with me, while I confess, that it would be altogether inconsistent with an inviolable regard to sincerity and truth, should I speak or write of Mr. Campbell as I should feel bound to speak or write of a Presbyterian, Episcopal, or Methodist minister, whom I considered a *real* christian; and from whom I differed in some point of doctrine not essential to salvation. He himself treats the Presbyterian clergy, if not all others who preach from texts, or who *presume* to think themselves capable of forming conclusions different from his own, as unceremoniously and as *magisterially* as if he did really believe that they had always been, and are still, in the mere alphabet of religious knowledge; and that himself alone (with the aid of his *proselytes*) were *qualified to teach*, and that without the aid of the Holy Spirit, the more docile, and to *scourge the dunces* into the knowledge and obedience of the truth.

In conclusion I must remark that I enter reluctantly upon this business. For the last seven years I have devoted my time and my talents to the work of the ministry. It has been in many respects pleasant, if it has not been my meat and my drink, to preach to sinners, as well as I know how, "the unsearchable riches of Christ" —to feed the flock of God which he hath purchased with his own blood. I aim to serve, with religious instruction, a poor people, scattered over a considerable extent of country, where preachers are scarce and the people willing to hear. Whatever therefore interferes with that which I feel to be a privilege, if it be not a duty, I regard as a cross. But I have been personally acquainted with some of the distresses brought into the churches at Hopeful and Southanna worship houses, through the medium of the *little* pamphlet *called* the Christian Baptist. Even *so faithful* a reporter as Mr. Aristarchus, will allow, no doubt, that *there* were "bitter envyings, and strife, and confusion, and every evil work." What has already been the lot of these churches may be the lot of others. Keeping in view the patience of my Divine Master, who "when he was reviled, reviled not again;" sustained by the conscious sense of an inviolable regard to the unadulterated truth of the gospel; mourning over the calamitous visitations of that error which is robbing our churches of their genuine glory; and feeling sensibly impelled by the strong convictions of duty to give my feeble aid in raising the embankments of TRUTH against the coming inundation of SOPHISTRY, I hesitate no longer in estimating the probable consequences of my appearance before the public, as the open and decided disclaimer and opponent of Mr. Campbell's views. As I send this only as an introductory communication, it is proper for me to mention that I purpose, God willing, to forward to you the result of

my examinations, about once-a-month. Since these examinations will be confined to the volumes of the Christian Baptist, I shall not turn aside to notice any replications or vindications which the author of that work may think proper to make during the progress of the discussion. ABNER W. CLOPTON.

## REPLY TO MR. CLOPTON'S INTRODUCTION.

THE preceding is Mr. Clopton's introductory, and, as usual in such cases, it abounds in assertion only. Nothing was to be proved but Mr. Clopton's opinions of me, and that required nothing but his simple assertion. That he has a very unfavorable opinion of me, he has fully declared, and I acknowledge myself convinced of it. Such an opinion had many of the most devout of the Scribes and Pharisees, of the elders and rulers of Israel, both of Jesus and his Apostles. Such an opinion of Wickliffe, Jerome of Prague, John Huss, Luther, Melancthon, and all other eminent reformers, had the pious clergy of the Roman church. Such an opinion had the Virginia Episcopalians of the old Baptist teachers in Goochland, Culpepper, and many of the lower counties. Let the pages of Semple's History of the Baptists, of Benedict's History, of Jones' History, be examined, and a thousand instances of the same sort will be found. It is not extraordinary that Mr. Clopton should have such opinions of me, nor that he should honestly avow them. Thousands of good and honest Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, have entertained and honestly avowed such opinions of the most eminent public benefactors.—Whether the opinions are well or ill-founded, is another question; and Mr. Clopton is too good a scholar to be told that it is one thing to assert an opinion, and another to show that it is well founded.

Mr. Clopton has honored me with a comparison with Whitfield, Lord Byron, and Saul of Tarsus. He ranks me among the sages and the learned from whom God has *hid* the gospel, and of course he places himself among the babes to whom it is revealed. God hid the gospel from the learned Byron, and revealed it to the babe Milton; from the learned Saul of Tarsus, and revealed it to the babe Paul; from the Scribe Alexander Campbell, and revealed it to the babe Abner W. Clopton. In this Mr. Clopton seems to rejoice.

I cannot avoid remarking, as I pass along, that the meaning of this sentence has never yet been revealed to Mr. Clopton. He applies Luke x. 21. in the Calvinian sense. It has been revealed to him (in my opinion) by Dr. Gill or Andrew Fuller! Having renounced these masters, I have learned that the passage in its context reads thus:—"At that time Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou, having hid these things from the wise and learned, and revealed them to babes; yes, O Father, that it thus seemed good in thy sight." Thou didst not employ the sages of this world to publish thy gospel; thou didst not reveal to the philosophers of Greece and Rome thy gospel, but to the poor and illiterate, that they might with more credibility publish it to the world.—No man can know the Father

but the person to whom the Son reveals him. *Therefore come to me*, said Jesus, that you may know; for none else can teach you. It was designed by this saying to draw sinners to Jesus for instruction, and to his Apostles; and not to discourage any person by telling him that God hides from him, or may hide from him, and reveal to some other person, regardless of his coming to Jesus, or attempting to come.

But to return. Mr. Clopton considers himself as one of the babes to whom this revelation has been made, and places me among those persons from whom it is hid; and thus he feels himself authorized to decide my character and state, and to speak of me with all the certainty that a philosopher could decide and speak of the attainments of a pupil just entering the school of science. Against such assumptions there is no argument, for there is no argument in them. I know of no cure for conceit; neither did Solomon. "Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit: there is more hope of a fool than of him." When two persons meet in argument, and the one saith, "Sir, I have a special revelation, and you have not; it is given to me to understand—to you it is not given;" what reply can be given? It is of no use to quote scripture: for he will tell you that he has had it revealed to him in this sense, and you take it in the ordinary meaning of the text and context. You are unregenerate. I am, says he, regenerate; to me it has been revealed; from you it is hid. This is a triumphant argument. It is like rising up against a king, to rise up against such a "*spiritual man*." Mr. Clopton is, then, an inspired man, having had a special revelation. I am not inspired, and make no such pretensions. I claim no infallibility. I therefore argue that the Bible means what it says; *for if it do not, it is no revelation at all.* To say that we have a written *revelation* from God, and at the same time affirm that unless there is another revelation of it, it is unintelligible, is a contradiction in terms.

It is owing to this inspiration, this superior advantage which Mr. Clopton has over me, that he can describe my manner of public speaking, and the effects produced upon my hearers, though he never heard me in his life, nor witnessed the effects of my instructions upon my hearers! He has seen what I never saw; and has promulged it as a fact, that, "from the exhibitions of Mr. Campbell, sinners retire in all the levity and sportiveness of theatrical spectators." On what authority does Mr. Clopton affirm this? Those who have heard me, can, in myriads, attest that the very reverse of this is fact, as respects the character of my congregations. I have seen more laugh, more gaiety, and more dissipation at one Association, than I have seen at all the meetings I have addressed. And it is a fact, that, never in my life, in city or country, did I reprove man, woman, or child, for rudeness or for noise, or for misbehavior of any sort while I was speaking. But, perhaps, as Mr. Clopton looks beyond the literal meaning of scripture, he sees farther into the human heart than I can.

In his third paragraph he gives some positions from some manuscript, said to have been written by some person who said he heard some J. C. affirm them, and then concludes that the said positions are

substantially the same with what he read in the *little* pamphlet. Why did not Mr. Clopton appeal to the Christian Baptist direct? It is probable he never read it.

Mr. Clopton was a subscriber for some four years for the Christian Baptist. A preacher from Kentucky once called by me on his return from a visit to Mr. Clopton. He informed me that he had spent some time reading in Mr. Clopton's library, and that he saw a file of the Christian Baptist, lying by themselves, the leaves uncut, and obviously never read. He may yet find it more convenient to glean from manuscripts and from hearsay, than to examine for himself. I do hope that he will now be under the necessity of reading the work carefully; and if he do, I flatter myself that perchance he may find it not so condemnable as to excommunicate its author.

"If these six positions, says he, "be the way to learn Christ, the faith once delivered to the saints, the means by which the saints are to come to the unity of the faith, &c. then he is a stranger to the meaning of God's book." This is a possible case, and to me a probable one. But surely Mr. Clopton will not affirm that either Mr. J. C. or myself held or taught these positions in this light! Are his logical powers of no higher order than to cause him to infer that every five or six positions which every preacher assumes or defends, are held forth as the way to learn Christ, or as the faith once delivered to the saints, &c.!! I hope he will appear to more advantage than this in his future efforts. If he should not, we will make free to show that his reasoning powers need a little cultivation, notwithstanding his high attainments in language and criticism.

He next boasts of the prosperity and respectability of the English and American Baptists, and thence infers that their faith and doctrine are sound. Mr. Clopton will have to use better logic that this if he expect the thinking part of the community will respect his conclusions. Will not the prosperity and respectability of the Catholics, Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, &c. &c. &c. prove as much for *them* as the prosperity and respectability of the Baptists!!

He next gives *his opinion* of the New Translation. He promises to examine it! We hope he may furnish us with some improvements and emendations. We shall thank him for them. I am willing to learn even from Mr. Clopton. *Fas est ab hoste discere.* (It is right to learn even from an enemy.) We shall expect solid reason, good sense, and sound criticism from Mr. Clopton on the New Testament. His mere opinion, influenced, as he has proved it to be by strong prejudice, will not go far with those who think, and I would flatter myself that he will not deal out mere assertions, as though a saying of his would preponderate the decision of seven men who can render a reason.

His *telling* the readers of the Star that my mind is *carnal;* that I am aspiring to pre-eminence, to *wealth* and fame, may come with a good grace from one of those who are inspired and supernaturally endowed with the "gift of discerning spirits;" but from me it would not pass for much, and therefore I will only return it as an uncurrent note to

its owner. I have attended in the 10th number of the Christian Baptist to Mr. Brantly's note upon the word "*wealth*," and shown the injustice he has done me in it.

I am sorry to observe the signal of retreat in Mr. Clopton's "gasconade." He breathes out threatening and slaughter, but tells us when boasting of his designs, that if he is likely to be hard pressed, he will leave the field; nay, rather, that he will fight outside of the fence. He is determined to keep out of the entrenchment. He will neither be a Walker, nor a M'Calla, nor an Owen.

He asks for the indulgence of a little animation, but promises to be calm; and claims the licence of the Mahometans to call me not a "*christian* dog," but simply a "dog!" But he will not turn aside to notice "any replication or vindication" which I may offer. No, indeed, he asks for the indulgence of being animated, of talking of my natural or carnal mind, of representing me "*an evil worker*;" and that I will indulge him so far as not to expect that he will vindicate nor defend himself, but just fire his gun and retreat!! Ah! what cowards are these supporters of human traditions! How fearful to risk themselves or their system to manly, rational, and scriptural examination. Yet this man talks of "great swelling words of vanity," and of his "knowledge of the scriptures."

He moreover claims the privilege of abusing me as one not to be treated with the courtesy due any Presbyterian or Methodist. He begs of his "*dear brethren*" with whom he has had "*sweet* communion, to indulge him in not speaking or writing of Mr. Campbell as he should feel bound to speak or write of a Presbyterian, Episcopal, or Methodist minister"!! and hopes he will have the patience of his Divine Master in reviling me!!! I dare not say much upon this point. I am determined to submit to indignities and reproaches, and I fear to allow my pen the licence of a single remark upon the above. I will speak and write of Mr. Clopton as I would of any Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Methodist minister. I will not declare him out of the pale of common courtesy, and shall treat him with at least common respect. What have I said which provokes such hatred and resentment? And who is Mr. Clopton? A solicitor for the Columbian College and Star.

I thank Mr. Clopton for his coming out. I hope he will persevere until he is better informed, and that he will not only make assertions, but attempt to fortify them with all his talents and learning, that the people may again see how destitute of reason and scriptural support every sectarian scheme is. If any thing can be said better than his predecessors have said, we shall pay all attention to it; and if not, we shall be farther convinced that the supporters of popular notions follow one another as oxen treading upon a wheel. EDITOR.

## HISTORY OF SIN, INCLUDING THE OUTLINES OF ANCIENT HISTORY—*NO. I.*

AS respects the malignity of sin, I have found but two sects. The one expatiates upon its demerit until language fails; the other is

always extenuating its malignity. One class represents it as a natural and almost innocent infirmity of human nature, while the other fails to give birth to their conceptions of its atrocious nature and destructive tendency. To those who labor to diminish our abhorrence of sin, christianity and all its wonderous works of mercy and favor appear an unnecessary and extravagant display about nothing; but to those who contemplate it in the light which revelation pours upon it, every thing in the economy of mercy attests the wisdom and favor of God displayed in the gospel.

Observing the tendency of the two systems, we are induced to propose the question, *What is sin?* In defining the act, it is no more, says John, than "*the transgression of law.*" And if we ask, what is law, as respects sin, Paul avers that it is "the strength of sin." But to develope the import of the monosyllable *sin*, it is necessary to consider what are the prominent ideas attached to law. There is the authority of the lawgiver which passes into the law, and there is the nature and design of the law itself. As far as relates to the authority of the law, sin is simply *rebellion*; but as respects the nature and design of the law, it is what is sometimes called *wickedness*. The transgression of a law purely arbitrary, positively requiring obedience without regard to any thing but the authority of the lawgiver, is pure rebellion. But if the law have a moral tendency, then the transgression of it superadds to rebellion the idea of wickedness or crime.

The first law promulgated on earth, under which man was at first placed, was a positive and arbitrary statute prohibiting an act neither good nor evil in itself; and was therefore, the best conceivable test of the loyalty and subordination of the subject to whom it was given. The transgression of such a law can be considered in no other light than as an act of pure rebellion. The language of such a transgression is simply this, "*Thou shalt not reign over me.*" In an act of pure rebellion, the malignity of sin appears more striking, more plain than when contemplated in connexion with an immoral tendency. The enormity of such an act, which has nothing to call it forth but simple aversion or disregard to the authority of God, can never be developed in language intelligible to mortal man. When any creature acquainted with his Creator tells him to his face, either in word or deed, "Thou shalt not reign over me," before we can have any idea of such an act, we must understand the relation and obligation in which a man stands to his Creator. But this is impossible. When a child rises up against his father and dethrones him, all men of clear perceptions consider him as a monster rather than as a man. They know something of the relation existing between the parties, and of the obligations and duties thence resulting. But this is a very faint and a very imperfect analogy of the relation and obligation existing between man and his Creator. It is just as easy for man to weigh the universe in scales, as to fathom the nature of sin contemplated only as an act of rebellion against God.

The Bible itself makes no effort to develope the nature of sin by any description drawn up in words. This admonishes us not to attempt it. What shall we say then? Are we without any means of forming any idea at all of the nature of sin? No, we have to learn it not from verbal description, but from its effects and from the means of its cure. It is very difficult to explain any of the vegetable or mineral poisons. When we see a dog, a horse, or a man drop dead in an instant of time, when only touched with a drop of prussic acid, we have a better idea of its inherent poisonous influence, than from any verbal description of it.

The history of sin is then the best developement of its nature. But all the history to which we have access, belongs to time, and time only belongs to history. The history of sin, therefore, to which we look, is a history which only reaches back to the birth of the world. At its birth all was good, and therefore all was happy. Before the rebellion in Eden, all was good, all was very good. In the world not a groan, not a sigh was heard, till sin was born. No gloom, no pain, no sorrow any where. But the instant man rebelled, the heavens were overcast, the Sun lost his brightness, the earth its fertility, the air its salubrity, Eden its bloom, woman her beauty, and man his crown. Nature was immediately diseased in all her members. A consumption was introduced into her whole system, which must issue in a universal decline. The leprosy continued to spread until the whole habitation of man was infected. Human enjoyment was poisoned at the fountain, and all its streams were corrupted. The fruit of every tree degenerated, and the tree of life was rendered inaccessable to mortal man.

In contemplating this change, these results, we begin to learn something of the nature of sin. Hearing all nature groan, seeing the agonies and pains of all that live, feeling the seeds of mortality thickly sown in our own persons, and tracing all these to their proper source, we discover that one sin, one act of rebellion, one single transgression, is the root of all this bitterness and grief. This brought death into the world, and all our woe. When we hear all the millions of human beings begin the journey of life with a scream, and see death lording it over them all; when we survey the rueful wastes, we begin to feel that there is a malignity in sin which no eye can see, which no tongue can utter and which no pencil can paint.

From one act of rebellion, called the sin of Adam, death entered the world, and passed down with every generation; so that all the millions of infants and men pine away and die. By that one offence death has reigned even over them who never sinned as Adam did by transgressing a positive law. All have felt the pains, all, all have tasted the bitterness of transgression in being subjected to death, and to corruption in the grave.

The first sin can be estimated, only in connexion with all that has followed. For all the sins of sinners are the consequences of the sin of Adam. The serpent which stings a tree poisons not only

the roots, trunk, branches, and foliage, but every insect which feeds upon it feels the sting in its own privations, pains, and death. In one word, every disease, moral and physical, in the experience of the whole animal creature, is but a consequence of that one transgression. One transgression hurled from their dignity the legions of heavenly potentates, and cast them down to Tartarus forever without the hope of reprieve, and without remedy; and in our world one transgression has visited upon all the generations of men all the calamities to which mortal man is heir.

Angels had but *one* life, and were incapable of another, and that one life was lost forever. God put the sin of angels forthwith under punishment; but the sin of Adam was put under government that there might be a possibility of its cure. The nature of sin is further developed, as we learn the character of that remedial government under which it has been placed. We shall, therefore, attend to some of the more signal acts of the divine government over sin.

And first let it be remarked, that had it not been for this remedial government, man would have been snatched from transgression to judgment, as were the angels who sinned. But man is spared. "*A respite unto life,*" a sentence "of justification unto life," as Paul affirms, has come upon all men, in consequence of the mediation of Adam the second. But notwithstanding the respite which has been granted, (and were it not for that none could have been born, nor any of those since born, could have lived;) still there is a maximum in the sin of man beyond which it has not been permitted to reach.

The sin of Cain differed from that of Adam in many respects. I shall only mention one. It was not like Adam's original sin; for that was the act of rebellion of a perfect man; this was not only an act of rebellion as respected the great Lawgiver; but as respected the nature of the act, it was wicked and vicious in the extreme. Its consequences upon Cain and upon his family for generations, cannot now be traced. But it stung his posterity down to the Deluge. At the Deluge the sin of the world had attained to that maximum beyond which it could not be permitted to pass.

But to resume the sin of Adam again, I would say emphatically that it differed from every sin since committed upon the earth. *It was the sin of a perfect man. All other sins are the sins of sinful men.* The malignity of sin can therefore be more clearly discerned through this consideration, than through any other media. There have been but *two sins* committed, of which the ear of man has ever heard, from which the malignity of sin can, in any degree, be apprehended. This idea, though new to me, I think is entitled to some consideration. The crucifying the Lord of glory, though the greatest sin of sinners, and entailing upon a nation a curse which almost two thousand years has not completed, is but a feeble illustration of the malignity of sin compared with the two sins I have now in my eye. All sins flowing from a sinful nature, or from a nature impaired and debased, have some or many extenuating considerations which keep the malignity of sin out of view, and actually diminish it. The

injurious acts of an idiot have not the demerit of the same acts of one of sound mind and reason. No sin which one of Adam's children can commit, has the same malignity in it which the first transgression had, and from it alone can we learn the heinous nature of transgression. I need scarcely inform my readers that the other sin, to which I allude, is the sin of the rebel angels. Their transgression, whatever the act may have been, was the transgression of perfect intelligences and of perfect beings. I pretend not to explain either of these acts—the consequences of them are the only explanations of them which can be relied on. Many have impiously laughed at the story of Eve's eating the apple as a ridiculous cause for entailing such mischiefs upon the world. Their laugh deserves such pity as the laugh of an idiot, at the cause which deprived him of his reason. The liberality of the grant made to the progenitors of our race, and the smallness of the restriction laid upon them, exhibit the magnitude of the transgression. So we must reason. The less the temptation, the greater the sin. He, who owning ten thousand sheep, seizes by violence the widow's lamb, sins more grievously, than would the widow if she should steal the ten thousand sheep.

But as was said, the only exposition of the nature of these two sins is the consequences which flow from them. The former involved in irremediable ruin the angelic transgressors. The latter subjected the human race to all the miseries of the present life; and such of them as are not cured of the deadly disease, are, with the angels who kept not their first estate, doomed to everlasting destruction. *Sic stat sententia omnipotentis.* So stands the decree of the Almighty. All the sins of all the world, and all the evils attendant on them, are developements of the sin of Adam (or of Eve,) and must be all taken into view with all the train of natural evils consequent upon them, before we can think aright of what sin is. The sins of sinners, though so grievous and so full of misery, are but specks in comparison of the sin of a perfect being. Yet we find some of those singled out, and the history of their consequences detailed for many generations, to teach men the malignity thereof.

Cain's transgression drove him still farther from the presence of the Lord. Not one of his posterity is distinguished for piety, and the whole of his race perished in the Deluge. The virtuous and devout part of the race sprang from him who filled the place of Abel in the affection of his parents and the favor of God. The children of Cain were the children of men, and were skilled in the arts of men; but the sons of God were amongst the children of Seth, and the intermarriages of these with the daughters of men, consummated the apostacy of the old world; and so filled the earth with violence that their crimes reached unto heaven and brought down ruin upon a whole generation.

It was 1656 years from the Creation to the Deluge. Allowing that the posterity of Adam after deduction for the loss by death, only doubled every 40 years, which is a very reasonable calculation, then there must have been upon the face of the earth at the time of the

Deluge, more than two billions of human beings. But this is almost incredible; yet dividing 1656 by 40, it gives 41 generations; and 2 multiplied into itself 41 times gives more than two billions as the product. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, taking the longevity of that period into view, but that a number far surpassing the present population of the earth, perished in the Deluge. Of all these millions, "of their names, their exploits, their fame, there is no memorial. The earth once glowed with their labors, and groaned under their wickedness; but they with all the monuments of their skill and power sunk in the remorseless deep." Sin has in this universal catastrophe a monument erected to its memory on which is inscribed its awful enormity, and the sure and certain consequences which must follow in its train to every child of Adam, who is not released from its guilt, cleansed from its pollution, and emancipated from its dominion. EDITOR.

## CHRISTIANOS AND THE EIGHTH CHAPTER OF ROMANS.

A WRITER in the *Religious Herald*, signed "Christianos," has taken a prodigious alarm, and vows that he will sound an alarm on some holy mountain in the plains of the Bowling Green. And what is the alarm? He sees, or thinks he sees, "some attempts to banish the pursuasion of *a divine operation upon the soul of man*"—"a sentiment which ought to make every christian shudder"—"and other items of grievous import;" such as *man's ability to obey the gospel;* the identity of baptism and being born of water and of the spirit, what he calls regeneration. He sees, or thinks he sees, other monsters squinting at a rejection of the atonement. All these he sees like a race of giants springing from the stones Deucalion threw over his shoulder. Such spectres haunt the imagination of this timorous unknown *Christianos*.

I sincerely pity every man who is the subject of such periodical paroxisms. Whether to recommend the shower-bath, or an electrifying machine, I know not; but I presume something is necessary to give a healthy tone to his nervous system. To have cured the good Richard Baxter of the hydrophobia, and the mild *Christianos* of such spasmodic affections, perhaps may be equally beyond the skill of the medical and spiritual faculty.

This fit was brought on by hearing me lecture upon the 8th chapter of the Romans, in the Bowling Green, Caroline county, Va. in January last. Had I known that such a nervous hearer was in the congregation, I might have been more cautious. But my ignorance, I hope, will excuse me. We shall, however, examine into the cause. It is this: I gave a view of the 26th verse which did not accord with the philosophy of Christianos. And such is, or appears to be, the temperament of Christianos, that, if a favorite text is not applied as he has been wont to apply it, the church is in danger! the essential doctrine is denied! His confidence is gone. His eye is jaundiced.

"*He sickens by the very means of health.*"

With him "*a divine operation upon the soul*" is the life's blood of christianity. My discourse in the Bowling Green was to declare for practical purposes *a divine operation upon the bodies of the saints.* Now I teach *both a divine operation by moral means upon the soul, and a physical operation upon the bodies of saints.* This is a fair statement of the case. I know of but two kinds of power in the universe. The one is *moral*, and the other *physical.* The minds of christians are the subject of the former, and their bodies will be the subject of the latter. I make this statement for the benefit of Christianos and all who have drunk out of human fountains of theology. The Spirit of God, clothed in the gospel institution, is the operator in the one case; and that same agent which raised to life again the dead body of Jesus and gave to it immortality, will exhibit itself in the other.

But these admirers of Fuller and Gill, these adorers of St. Andrew and St. John, are alarmed if a single text is not applied according to their direction. So entrammelled are their minds with the cords of system, they never can progress farther than the spider whose walks are measured by the thread he weaves out of his own bowels.

I selected the 8th chapter of the Romans, from the 17th verse to the end, as a proper subject from which to enforce with exhortations this most consoling hope, that our bodies shall be the subject of a divine and supernatural operation. I shall, for the sake of some who have solicited it, and for the sake of others who have misrepresented that discourse, and especially with a view to relieve *Christianos*, give a very condensed view of that branch of my discourse based on that section of the 8th chapter. Premising here what I said there, that, in in the views given of the 26th verse, I had no authority nor countenance from any of the living, nor from any of the writers on that epistle now dead, that I know of. I gave it as resting solely upon my own judgment, and therefore wished all to examine it with caution and candor.

The following is an outline of the view given of the whole section: 'All Christians are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ in the future and eternal inheritance. If, therefore, we hold fast our begun confidence unshaken to the end; if persecutions and bodily afflictions cause us not to apostatize; if, in one word, we *suffer* with Christ, we shall be *glorified* with him at the resurrection. To patience and perseverance, therefore, I exhort, because of the certainty and the magnitude of the glory to be revealed in us and upon our bodies when the Lord comes.

So high, argues he, are my conceptions of the glory to be displayed in our bodies at the resurrection, that I do not reckon the sufferings of this present time, in their most complicated and appalling form, as worthy to be compared with that glory which shall be revealed in our persons at the resurrection. The most earnest desire and longing expectation of mankind, of the sensitive creation, waits for nothing, anticipates nothing more desirable, more transporting, than the full developement of the saints in their glorified bodies as the sons of God. We are not yet revealed in person as the sons of God; the world know

eth us not; we know not the beauty and majesty of our immortal bodies; but we know that we shall be like the Son of God in personal beauty and glory.

To decay, corruption, and worms, or to vanity, this creation, these mortal bodies of ours have been subjected; not, however, as a voluntary agent subjects himself to a master; but by him we are subjected to this vanity or corruption, in hope; yes, to a hope that this very creation, these mortal bodies of ours shall be freed from the slavery of this corruption that they may enjoy the glorious freedom from corruption which belongs to them who are children of God.

For we know that this whole creation is *groaning* together, and even till now are all in pain, as a woman in travail. Nay, even they who have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves, are groaning within ourselves, waiting for an adoption—I mean, the redemption of our bodies from the dominion of mortality. For to this hope we have escaped, and by it we are sustained. But remember it is *hope*, and not enjoyment; for hope attained is not hope; for what a man enjoys he does not hope for. But, beloved, if we hope for these glorified bodies, let us patiently wait for them. 'Tis to a patient endurance of afflictions in these mortal bodies I exhort you.

Now if we exercise this patience in our corporeal sufferings, the spirit helps us to sustain these bodily infirmities; for we do not know when oppressed with bodily pains and infirmities, what we should pray for as suitable to our condition. I, Paul, when groaning under these infirmities, have repeatedly prayed to be delivered from some trials, but the Lord did not deliver me as I expected, or as I prayed, but in a way which I did not expect. I say, then, the spirit itself speaks for us to God; it intercedes for our deliverance by groans which cannot be expressed in words. For although our spirit groans under these bodily afflictions and infirmities, and cannot give utterance to its own desires; yet when patiently bearing these trials, its groans have a meaning which is understood. Yes, he who searches the heart knows what these groans mean. He knows the bent of the spirit; he knows that it desires deliverance for the saints according to the will of God. And although we may not understand the design or utility of these afflictions which make our spirits groan, we know that all things are working together for good to them who love God—to them who, according to a previous purpose, are now actually called. For those who love God, whom he before approved, even these he marked out beforehand to be of a form the same as that of the image of his Son; that, as they had borne the image of Adam the first, so exactly they shall wear the image of Adam the second; so that the only difference in appearance between him and his joint heirs, between the Son and the children of God, will be, that he is the *first born* from the dead; and they, the children, the second birth of the resurrection. And permit me to add, that those whom he predestinated, or before marked out to be of a like form and glory with his Son, he has now actually called and acquitted them; he has pardoned them, and glorified them with the title, rank, and spirit of sons of God. So that we are now

the sons of God, though not revealed as such. We know, then, brethren, that when this earthly house of our tabernacle is dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this creation we *groan* in the earnest expectation and desire to clothe ourselves with that house of ours, that heavenly habitation; and surely, having that on, we shall not be found naked. For, indeed, we who are in this dwelling do *groan*, being loaded with a burthen, for which we do not wish to unclothe ourselves, but to be clothed with immortality, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life.*

What, then, shall we say to these things? God being for us, who can be against us? He who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how can it be that he will withhold less favors from us! Will he not, with this inestimable gift, freely give us all things! Who shall lodge an accusation against them whom God has chosen? God who acquits them! No. Who shall condemn them? Christ who died for them! rather, indeed, who is raised up for them, placed at the right hand of God, and who intercedes for us! Who, then, shall separate us from the love of Christ which burns within us? That love which we have for him, who shall extinguish it? Shall tribulation, bodily distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, or the sword of our enemies? True, indeed, to these we are exposed; for so a prophet foretold—"For his sake we are killed all the day long, we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter." We, indeed, in all these bodily sufferings, are more than conquerors through him who first loved us, and called us into his kingdom and glory. Though I thus expostulate with you, brethren, I am persuaded that neither bodily sufferings, nor persecutions; nay, not death itself, nor the promise of this life, nor angels, principalities, nor powers on earth, nor things present, nor future; nor height, nor depth, nor any other created being, shall be able to separate us from loving God, from the love of him which is produced in us through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Such was the view given of this passage. This was the cause of the alarm! Now, candid reader, I ask you, is there not a unity, a correspondence, a perfect compatibility in this whole section with that one object avowed in the introduction; with that position which gave rise to it, viz.—"*If we suffer with him, that so we may be glorified together with him.*" Does he not declare the grand purpose of God to be, to conform the saints in their bodies hereafter, as in their minds now, to the image of his Son? Has he not promised to change our humbled bodies into a form like to his own glorious body, according to that *strong working* by which he is able to subdue all things to himself? And is not this the hope from which the Apostle exhorts to patience under bodily sufferings?

But we differed from Matthew Henry, from John Wesley, and from John Gill. The two former argued the restoration of the brutal creation from this passage. And the latter, with a hundred others, made

*2 Cor. v. 1,—This passage very much justifies this view of Romans viii.

the spirit of man, in verse 26th, the Spirit of God; or rather, the spirit of patience the Spirit of God "in his official character." Christianos sees through his green glasses some squinting here against a divine operation upon the soul! For my part, I have no squinting, in right or left eye. I have no system to squint to, nor any to squint against. I wish to look straight forward to the infallible guide. And this way of interpreting scripture to aid a system is most obnoxious to my aversion, because I think it profaning the oracle of God, and destructive to all true piety.

It is true I have given to the 26th verse a meaning which is not fashionable; but I hope none will reject it on that account, until they examine the passage and compare it with the references alluded to in it. I do not here give the arguments, nor the criticisms by which this view is supported. I simply present the view itself. And I ask, is it either immoral or irreligious in its tendency? Nay, is it not most moral and religious, most practical in its tendency? But I make no bond of union, no term of communion, no condition of fellowship in the adoption or rejection of it. I have no such intolerant spirit. I offer it as favor to those who look for instruction. If they tell me they cannot receive it, I feel no indignation. If they acquiesce in it, I feel no complacency in them unless their lips and lives agree. But if Christianos denounce me on this account, let him prove that *he* is not intolerant as a Pope, and let him give us a connected view of the whole passage.

I will suggest to him the following hints to aid him in approving or condemning according to his superior judgment:—

1. There is no adjunct or epithet attached to the term *spirit*, in the 26th verse, which would authorize the conclusion that the Spirit of God is referred to.

2. To represent the Spirit of God as *interceding* for the saints, is incompatible with any office or work assigned to the Spirit in any passage in the Old or New Testament. He cannot furnish a sentence in all the volumes of revelation which looks like it.

3. Paul, in this context, represents the Lord Jesus as interceding for us. QUERY.—*Does the Holy Spirit and the Saviour sustain the same office?*

Why should the Spirit of God use groans which cannot be expressed in words? Does this weakness belong to that Divine Agent?

5. In some versions, in Thomson's, and in the King's Translation, it reads, "He or it makes intercessions for the saints according to the will of God." Is it admissible to say that the Spirit of God, in this or any given case, makes intercession for the saints *according to* the will of God, or *according to God*. The Spirit of God, acting according to the will of God, in any one case, implies an incongruity for which there is no analogy in the book of God.

6. If I were to make this matter plain to a child, I would ask what propriety in saying that these groans were examined in the heart and understood in the heart by God, if the Spirit of God uttered these groans himself?

An inattention to the Hebraisms in Paul's style, and in the style of the New Testament, has given rise to some difficulties. Why a man's *spirit* could speak for himself or intercede for himself, or how the first person and the third person can be applied indiscriminately to the same being, at the same time, is a puzzle to some. But to those who study the style of the New Testament, such usages will not appear strange. "Jesus rejoiced in spirit;" "Shall I come to you in the spirit of meekness?" "Lord Jesus receive my spirit;'. "I will pray with the spirit;" "Paul was pressed in spirit;" "I go bound in the spirit;" "be renewed in the spirit of your mind." The pronoun *I* represents the whole person; but how often in all languages is the body and the spirit personified and distinguished from one another; so that *I* represents the one, and *you* and *it* the other? *The love of God*, denotes both our love to him, and sometimes his love to us. I know, said Jesus, that you have not the *love of God* in you. This is the *love of God*, that we keep his commandments. Keep yourselves *in the love of God*—are instances of the former. In this was the *love of God* manifested. Hereby perceive we the *love of God*—are examples of the latter. In Romans viii. 39. it must mean our love to God, because afflictions and persecutions could not cause the love of God towards us to abate; but they might be supposed to lessen our love to God. These hints I suggest to him, or any other person, who may take a different view of this passage.

To conclude. What a consolation to christians, that, when groaning under afflictions, and unable how to express themselves, not knowing what to ask, their groans, which they cannot turn into language, have a meaning which God understands and regards. A patient spirit sustains infirmity, lightens the weight of persecution, and has a language more eloquent than the voice of words, and prays more effectually than any form of expression which the most fruitful imagination could invent. EDITOR.

*From the Vermont Chronicle.*

## "CAMPBELLISM."

IN the daily revolution of the earth, after midnight, we are borne on towards that point, at which the Sun will become visible; but before we arrive there, the light of the Sun, striking upon the higher parts of the atmosphere, is refracted or bent out of its natural course, and a few straggling rays find their way down to us, enabling us to see that we are surrounded with objects, but not to learn their true form and color, and thus giving occasion to errors, from which we should be perfectly safe in total darkness. And as the earth rolls on, and the light increases to the full blaze of day, and the illusions of twilight give place to objects clearly seen, other parts of the earth are following us through the various stages of the progress from midnight to noon-day; and their twilight visions, half fact, half fiction, indicate, as ours did, the approach of the light, in which they shall see all things clearly.

There is something much like this, in the progress of the human family from the depths of ignorance towards that fulness of knowledge, which is in reserve for us. It will, we think, invariably be found, that every error in theology, which has shown a tendency to reappear in different ages, and distant countries, is but "the refraction of some truth, yet below the horizon" of those who embrace it. *Error* it may really be, and hurtful; yet it arises from a degree of light, just sufficient to show that there is something to be seen, without showing distinctly what that something is.

These thoughts have been recalled to our mind, by seeing notices of the spread of "Campbellism," as it is called, at the West. This term is used to designate the doctrines of Alexander Campbell, well known for his dispute with Mr. Owen, on the evidences of christianity. The peculiarities of this scheme seem to be mainly comprehended in two points. First, that saving faith is only an historical belief of facts stated in the Bible. Secondly, that baptism, which is synonymous with immersion, and for which every such believer is a proper subject, actually washes away sin, and is regeneration. Of its progress at the West, a correspondent of the New York Baptist Register, says, "Mr. Campbell's paper, and their vigorous missionary efforts, are making great achievements. It is said that one half of the Baptist churches in Ohio have embraced this sentiment and become what they call, "Christian Baptists." It is spreading like a mighty contagion through the Western States, wasting Zion in its progress. In Kentucky, its desolations are said to be even greater than in Ohio." Other accounts confirm this statement.

It will be seen, that neither of these doctrines is new; and it would seem no very difficult task, to detect the truths of which they are the "refractions." As to faith, Mr. Campbell evidently overlooks the distinction between *believing a proposition to be true, and believing the truth asserted in that proposition.* We may believe an assertion in the Bible to be true, as in the cases of many prophecies, not yet fulfilled, while we are conscious that we do not understand it, and therefore do not believe the truth contained in it; nay, while perhaps, without knowing it we incline to the contrary opinion. The Jews believed most firmly that all that Moses had said was true; but yet they did not believe what Moses said; for he spake of Christ, whom they continued to reject. So most men in a christian land, believe that what the Bible says is true, but they do not believe the things, which the Bible says, in the sense attached to them by the Spirit of God. When men become really penitent, the terms used in the scriptures have a new meaning *to them.* Sin, holiness, mercy, justice, heaven and hell; what is said of the character of God, of Christ, and of man, as now understood, is new to them. They have *new ideas* on these subjects,—ideas, which stir their affections and control their lives. Whoever believes the assertions of scripture, understood as such men understand them, has a "faith which works by love," and which "purifies the heart." He who thus, understandingly, believes the assertions of the gospel, shall be saved. We might even

say, he that believes the single fact, of the death of the Son of God as a propitiation for sin, as is taught in the gospel, just as he believes any other historical fact, shall be saved; for we are taught in the gospel, that his death was an expression of holy love; and how can we understandingly believe this, unless we have learned, by feeling it, what holy love is?

One, who *thus* believes the truths of the gospel, will be obedient to its precepts; and the first act of obedience, flowing from faith, is evidence of forgiveness, and is connected with eternal life. Generally, among these converted under the preaching of the apostles, the first public act, by which this faith was manifested, was an open profession of it, and submission to the ordinances of christianity. Hence the language which is misinterpreted into the other error of "Campbellism."

From what we have learned concerning the state of theological opinions at the West, we anticipate a continued spread of this new edition of old errors; and we doubt whether those who seem now active in opposing them, will meet with much success, till they give up some favorite points of their own system.

—

## ANTI-CAMPBELLISM.

WE do protest against christening the gospel of Jesus and the christian religion, by the name of any mortal man. To carry the principle out, we ought to call every man's sentiments by his name. Because we have disclaimed creeds, names. and sects, our adversaries seem to take a pleasure in designating our writings and speeches by the name creed, Campbellism, theory, system, &c. This is both unmanly, and unchristian. Men, fond of nicknaming, are generally weak in reason, argument, aad prdof.

The writer of the above despatch, is not without his share of good reason and common sense. There are sundry good remarks in it. We differ from him in the application of them. He says, "there is a fulness of knowledge in reserve for us christians." Why, then, oppose any attempt to contribute to that fulness of knowledge? He has too much good sense to expect any new revelation from heaven—any new apostle or prophet. He expects this knowledge will be acquired from what is already written. We think so, and have a hundred times declared that there is a general—an almost universal ignorance of what is written in the oracles of God. The contradictory commentaries and sects are proof of this. The commentaries of Dr. Gill and Adam Clarke, works copiously strewed with the spoils of Rabbinical and Pagan literature, are incontestible proofs of the general ignorance of the scriptures. Does not every sect suppose that from all others the true meaning of the Scriptures is hid! The secret cause of this ignorance is the general presumption *that the Bible is not to be submitted to all the natural and common rules of interpretation to which all other books in the world are to be subjected.* The remains, and the

principles of the Gnostics,* those early corruptors of christianity, are yet operating in *the minds of sectarians. The mystic doctors are yet in high repute.*

The Baptists have their share of veneration for the mystic interpreters. Their Gill, excepting George Fox, is, perhaps, of all that have lived since the Reformation, the most finished mystic. He threw a seven fold veil over the face of the New Testament, and although frequently declaiming against the Gnostics, was as deeply imbued with their leading principles of interpretation as any Valentinian.

The writer of the above remarks has not, I think, perused many of the volumes of the Christian Baptist. If he had examined that work, he would not have made the two items he selects the peculiarities of the views he is pleased to ascribe to me. They are but "the refractions," to use his similitude, of some great truths contended for in that work, which are yet below his horizon. What he says upon the subject of faith, or my first peculiarity, I accede to. The proposition which he says I "evidently overlook," is, I was going to say, taken from the Christian Baptist. It is almost in the same words, found in one of my essays upon faith. He gives up that item in the conclusion of the fourth parapraph. I do not differ from himself in the value of a monosyllable, a mere expletive, upon that subject. Had he read the Christian Baptist, he would have found all his own distinctions clearly marked, and in support of the position which he pleases to call my first peculiarity.

His second is not so accurate a refraction of my views, but it is a refraction from them; and, therefore, I must request him to read again, that he may keep pace with the progress of the light or darkness as he may choose to designate it.

It is easy to call any thing "an old error" or "a new notion." And if I stood on the vantage ground, I could deal out as many "old errors"

*Gnostics (from Γνωστικος, knowing,) ancient heretics, famous from the first rise of christianity, principally in the East. It appears from several passages of scripture, particularly 1 John ii. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 20. Col. ii 8. that many persons were infected with the Gnostic heresy in the first century; though the sect did not render itself conspicuous, either for numbers or reputation, before the time of Adrian, when some writers erroneously date its use. The name was adopted by this sect, on the presumption that they were the only persons who had the true *knowledge* of christianity. Accordingly they looked on all other christians as simple, ignorant, and barbarous persons, who explained and interpreted the sacred writings in a low, literal, and unedifying signification. At first, the Gnostics were the only philosophers and wits of those times, who formed for themselves a peculiar system of theology, agreeable to the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato; to which they accommodated all their interpretations of scripture. But Gnostics afterwards became a general name, comprehending divers sects and parties of heretics, who rose in the first centuries; and who, though they differed among themselves as to circumstances, yet all agreed in some common principles. They corrupted the doctrine of the gospel by a profane mixture of the tenets of the oriental philosophy, concerning the origin of evil and the creation of the world, with its divine truths. Such were the Valentinians, Simonians, Carpocratians, Nicolaitans, &c. *Buck's Theol. Dict.*

and "new notions" as would employ the Vermont Telegraph a year to despatch, *secundum artem*, according to his art of deciding.

He anticipates a continued spread of these "old errors." He reminds me of Erasmus. "Unless those active in opposing them renounce their errors, this new edition of old errors will continue to spread." I think he is a true prophet, and I hope the event will prove him more sagacious than those Stars which rise in the West and set in the East. I care not for his calling them *old errors*. *Old* they may be, and *old* they are. The Jews considered the christian scheme an *error* and the Apostles as errorists; and it is a right which the Vermont Telegraph has to think and speak for himself. It is in the power of a few men to give great spread to these "old errors." Mr. Clopton and Mr. Brantly, and a few others, will aid much in their dissemination. They are not as wise as Dr. Gamaliel, though they mimic his brethren of the Sanhedrim. Perhaps my friend of the Telegraph may introduce these old errors into Vermont. I am sure they will never break one of his bones, nor cause his heart to ache when he thinks of appearing in the presence of the King.

One of my "new edition of old errors" is found well expressed in the following sentence:" "The Jews believed most firmly that all that Moses had said was true, but yet they did not believe what Moses said; for he spoke of Christ whom they continued to reject. So most men in a christian land believe that what the Bible says is true, but they do not believe the things which the Bible says, in the sense attached to them by the Spirit of God." This is just the fact. And it is the reason why most of the sectaries oppose the things taught in the Bible advocated by me. The Bible says, "He that believeth and is immersed shall be saved." How few believe it! The Bible says, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." How few believe it! The Bible says, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." I hope my friend of the Telegraph will not prove himself to be one of those who believe that what the Bible says is true, and yet reject the things which it most explicitly affirms! EDITOR.

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER

*Bloomfield, Ky, March* 18, 1830.

*Brother Campbell,*

FROM a very cursory perusal of the first number of your Millennial Harbinger, I learn that your pages are open to those of a different sentiment with yourself. Now, though I am not altogether opposed to your sentiments as expressed in your writings, yet I consider the invitation as extended to me; and, therefore, without further apology, I forward you for insertion a few prefatory paragraphs.

During my editorial labors, encomiums on your erudition, talents &c. expressive of *my* regard for you, were presented before the public My letters to you were dictated by the kindliest feelings, and every editorial paragraph was free from acrimonious invective. I have

ong since learned that good men may, and often do, think differently on a variety of religious subjects. I never expected that in all things a perfect coincidence of opinion should exist between myself and any man living. Neither is such a coincidence to be desired.

In your writings I found much to approve, and some things which I thought merited censure. From my first entrance into the church of God till the present moment, it has been my constant practice to "call no man master." Considering myself as alone responsible to my God, I drew the conclusion that I must think for myself. This most inestimable privilege, I, with the utmost cheerfulness, concede to all others; nor do I censure any one for the free exercise of this unalienable right.

Another point, namely this: "All men err," is to me self-evident. It needs no proof. If this be the fact, will it not necessarily follow that you, too, have erred? that in your writings sentiments have been expressed, and opinions advanced, and a spirit manifested, not sanctioned by the holy *dicta* of the inspired penmen? John. the holy and beloved disciple, recommends love to the brethren. Is it not a fact, brother Campbell, that, in some instances, your heart did not glow with that fervent charity which veils a multitude of faults? When making out your long list of specifications against your brother, it is thought that your feelings were not of the most peaceful nature. When castigating those from whose pens you have received a similar treatment, have you not sometimes forgotten those maxims of christian conduct which require gentleness, kindness, mercy, and love—forbearance and long-suffering?

Now, if it be admitted, (and you can but subscribe to the admission,) that you have often erred, both in judgment, and in awarding to all that benevolence inculcated by the gospel; ought you not to listen to the suggestions of a brother who seeks not to make himself known through your work, but to enter on the pages of your journal his objections to some of the exceptionable parts of your writings? He has no by-ends in view—open, unreserved, and free, he now approaches you, as he has always done, with the expectation of a most dispassionate hearing. Your former mode of replication can now have no place; but arguments of a milder nature are expected.

But for the unfavorable impression made on the minds of your readers, through the Christian Baptist, these remarks would never have appeared. Your readers have never heard me themselves; and many of them have been led to think of my course and sentiments as opposed to the gospel of God. For thinking that no discrepancy exists between your views and those taught by Paul and the other Apostles, my dissent from what you have taught will be considered by them as a dissent from the truth; whereas you yourself must confess that your sentiments are not worthy of all acceptation.

The vantage ground is all on your side. Not compelled, like myself, to labor daily for a dependent family, you have leisure to clothe your ideas in all the loveliness of the brightest drapery, to give harmony and cadence to every period, to revise, give strength

to the weak, and perspicuity to the obscure parts of every sentence and paragraph.

The vantage ground is yours. You hold the helm—I am only a passenger.

The vantage ground is yours. You write for those of your own opinion—I for those of a different opinion.

The vantage ground is yours. Your readers have an exalted conception of your talents—mine are esteemed of the humbler sort.

Thus, in every way, you have the vantage ground of me, excepting one, and that not the least—I have the same sure word of prophecy which you have—and to this shall be my first and last appeal—by its decisions are all human actions to be sustained or censured. If in the honest, sober, dispassionate examination of your sentiments, I should be successful in bringing yourself, and those who have imbibed your sentiments, to a nearer approximation to apostolic doctrine, I shall be amply rewarded.

In my next I shall present my first objection to your writings, with my reasons annexed. As I have not leisure for long communications, nor have you room for their insertion, I come to a close by subscribing myself yours, &c. S. CLACK.

## REPLY TO BROTHER CLACK.

*Dear Sir:*

IN addition to the good character which I had of you from some brethren of note in Kentucky, especially from the venerable standing Moderator of the Elkhorn Association, our brother Keeling, editor of the Religious Herald, Richmond, spoke to me of you in a manner very favorable and honorable to you as a disciple. I think he told me that you and he were classmates for some years under Doctor Staughton.

I have not supposed that you were, at any time, when editing the Baptist Recorder, wilfully or obstinately opposing my course from sinister motives. I never attributed it to you. I did consider you as simply *mistaken*, and that you were too much under the control of your brother editor, and somebody near Frankfort. But I harbor no resentment against any human being, and surely none against you for any thing you may have published, either as editorial or otherwise, in your paper. Indeed, I know not what you may have said of me in your paper, for I only saw it occasionally: by some fatality it came more irregularly to my office than any other paper. But, from what I have seen, and from what you say in your favor before me, I do assure you that there is no necessity ever to allude to the past to correct any impression on my mind injurious to you—for there is no such impression. If there ever was, it is erased. I am no longer conscious of it. If it did exist, I remember it no more.

That *all men err*, and, consequently, *you and I*, is, as you say, a self-evident position, and it is one reason why I never dare impose my inferences or my reasonings and conclusions upon others as terms of christian communion. Whatever is matter of fact, plain and in-

controvertible testimony, is that, and that alone, in which we cannot err—and that only should be made a term of communion. Our safety is in an *unerring* rule. By that let us walk; and if in any thing we should be otherwise minded, God will teach us, by our own experience, what we fail to learn from precept.

You ask me for a confession of my feelings, or propose such questions to me as call for an examination of the motives or influences which governed me in many pieces which I have published. Now it would be saying too much, for one who has been so roughly and so savagely used by many, under the cloak of religion, to say that I have never felt angry, or set down aught in a spirit incompatible with the gospel. But without conceding the right which any person may claim to bring me to confession, and without boasting of my motives and feelings, I will say, that they have been, if not universally, very generally, of the most benevolent and charitable character. Always in benevolence, but not always in the spirit of christian love, have I written. Let me explain. Some persons who have slandered and abused me, I do not love as christians. For as soon would I call the highwayman who had attacked me on the road, a christian, as some persons who have aspersed me. I feel, I think, towards them, as Paul felt towards Alexander the coppersmith. But yet there is not one of them for whose reformation and salvation I could not pray. And if it were in my power to reward them good for evil, I should rejoice in the opportunity. But when they appear as religious instructers and advocates of sound doctrine, I must not, I dare not, and I will not spare them. If I were writing my last essay, and about to lay down my pen forever, and they were the theme, I do not think that I would write in a different spirit, or speak in a different style of such persons. I differ, perhaps, in sentiment from you and many of my brethren, in what consists a *christian spirit*, a charitable spirit. John the Immerser, the Saviour of the World, and the Holy Apostles are my models in this, as in many other respects. To a generation of vipers, to a fox-like Herod, to Scribes and Pharisees who tithed mint, anise, and dill, and neglected righteousness, mercy, and the love of God; of such men as the false teacher in Corinth, the judaizers in Galatia, and the false teachers mentioned by Peter and Jude; of such men as Hymeneus, Philetus, Alexander, and Diotrephes, I would speak as the New Testament speakers have spoken. And still I would become all things to all men, that by all means I might save some. Such is my christian spirit. It is not the christian spirit of monks, friars, and nuns; of Shaking Quakers, flaming zealots, morose devotees, and superstitious ascetics.

My writings, I have learned from many sources, sometimes possess an asperity which is not at all indicative of my temperament of mind. I am, perhaps, in this a sort of paradox—constitutionally mild and charitable; but, as a writer, tart and severe. Of this, however, I am not an impartial judge; but it is an apology which my acquaintance make for me.

You place me on a new vantage ground, which I do not claim, and

one which cannot in all respects be admitted. My readers, in the aggregate, are not of my views more than they are of yours. But whether or not, you shall have a fair hearing, and every reasonable facility afforded you in correcting any of my errors. While ever I conduct a press, it shall be a *free press!* and my readers shall hear both sides. I will always judge for myself, and they shall have the same opportunity.

As you have read the Christian Baptist, it will be presumed that your objections, whatever they may be, will be such as have not been removed by any thing in that work. I should also wish you, brother Clack, to read, with your critical attention, the Cincinnati discussion upon the evidences of christianity, and to let your objections be such as remain after posting up the books till this date.

Be assured that your arguments shall be weighed, and examined, and responded to, if a response become necessary, in all christian candor, and in all regard for your christian character. And believe me, without guile, yours affectionately.

A. CAMPBELL.

April 1, 1830.

## THE VOICE OF GOD AND THE WORD OF GOD.

### THE GOSPEL NOW THE WORD OF GOD.

IT is very instructive to examine, with great accuracy, the various uses and applications of important words and phrases in the sacred writings. By so doing we form an acquaintance with the language which those holy men used as they spoke by the Holy Spirit; and from such an acquaintance with their language, we obtain the same ideas which they entertained of the great objects of christian faith and hope. Words and phrases which, in the Jewish writings, were used in a more general sense, are, in the New Institution, used in an appropriated sense. Thus while the term *Christ* was generally applied to all the anointed ones in the Jewish Age, it is in the apostolic writings exclusively appropriated to the Saviour. The phrase "*the Word of God*," is used in a like restricted sense in the apostolic writings. From the ascension of Jesus it is appropriated to denote the glad tidings concerning Jesus. This is its current acceptation; so that out of *thirty-four* times which it occurs, from Pentecost to the end of the volume, it thirty times obviously refers to the gospel. On three occasions it is applied to the literal *voice of God* at the Creation and the Deluge, and once to him who is in his own person the Word of God. But what I wish to note here, is, that it is never applied to any *writing* or *speech* from the day of Pentecost, but to the gospel or proclamation of mercy to the human race. The previous writings given to the Jews are not called the Word of God now, because this phrase has in it the idea of the present command and will of God.

"A word of God," or "a word of the Lord," or "a message from he Lord," are phrases which frequently occur in the Jewish scrip-

tures, and always refer to the immediate communication made by some messenger and addressed to some particular occasion. It did not mean what was before written or spoken, but what was spoken at that particular time, and by that particular person. For example, "a word of God came to Nathan;" "a word of God came to John in the wilderness." Some particular message is always intended, implying a command with promises or with threatenings accompanying. Now this is *the word* which as *glad tidings*, says Peter, has been announced to you. This is now the will of God that we should obey him whom he has commissioned.

If it were necessary to establish this by proofs and arguments, it were easy to adduce many. But I shall only add, as a very strong evidence of the justice of this discrimination, the following fact:—Multitudes who received the Jewish scriptures as containing revelations from God—the former communications and messages of God, are, by the penmen of the New Testament, said *to receive the word of God* only when they obeyed the gospel. Acts iv. 31. "They spoke *the word of God* with boldness;" "*the word of God* increased in Jerusalem." viii. 14. "They heard that Samaria had received *the word of God*." xiii. 44. "The whole city came to hear *the word of God*." 46. "It was necessary that *the word of God should have been first spoken to you Jews.*"

The same remarks apply to the phrase "*the word*," without any discriminating epithet, such as "*the word* which God sent to Israel"—by John. "Labor in *the word* and teaching." "If any one obey not *the word*." "They received *the word* with all readiness of mind." And so in every passage in the Epistles where there is no peculiar direction given to it from accompanying explanations.

Having so far traced the exact import of the phrase "*the word of God*," and "*the word*," in the apostolic writings, I proceed to notice the various epithets which are used to designate the peculiar character of the word of God, or the gospel.

It is called "the word of reconciliation; the word of life; the word of his favor; the word of faith; the word of truth; the word of righteousness; the implanted word, which is able to save your souls."—Such are the titles and descriptive epithets by which the word of God is recommended to us by its author. It is the word which reconciles man to the divine character, will, and government. It is the word through which life is communicated to man, and by which he comes into the enjoyment of life. It is the word of faith, the subject matter of the christian's belief, and the means by which we have confidence in God. It is the word of truth, or *the truth* emphatically, which delivers us from error and darkness, and imparts to the mind certainty in things unseen and future relative to the divine purposes. It is the word of righteousness by which we are accounted righteous in the sight of God, and by which alone we are qualified to live righteously. It is the implanted word, the word established by the Apostles in the world, which is able to save the soul. In a word, it is the word of

God's grace, or favor, by which alone we do enjoy the favor of God here, and are prepared to enjoy it forever.

The attributes of this word are strikingly displayed in the apostolic writings. It is called the *living* word, the sword of the Spirit. In one period Paul gives us a full description of it. Heb. iv. 12. "The word of God is *living* and *effectual*, and more cutting than any two edged sword, piercing even to the parting of both soul and spirit, and of the joints also and marrows, and is a discerner of the desires and purposes of the heart."

By it we are said to be purified, sanctified, begotten again, enlightened, saved. Nothing is so much extolled; no instrument so powerful, energetic, and effectual; so well adapted to its end, as *the word of God*. Every great moral change in man is ascribed to it; and it is uniformly presented to us as the great instrument of God's almighty power. It is *the voice* of the Almighty. By his voice all his great works have been accomplished. God commanded light to shine out of darkness, and the only instrument which he is said to have employed in the original creation was his *word*. In the new creation he has not changed his plan, or employed a new instrument. Of his own will he has impregnated us by the word of truth, and has made his word the very principle of renovation. *Hearing* is imparted to man by his word; for faith comes by hearing, and hearing itself comes by the word of God.

To hear many of the moderns, who profess to preach *the word*, talk of it as they do, and represent it as a *dead* and inefficient letter, is enough to provoke the meekness of a Moses, or to awaken the indignation of a Paul. The voice of God spoke the universe into being from the womb of nothing. The same voice recreates the soul of man, and the same voice will awaken the dead at the last day. His voice, heard or read, is equally adapted to the ends proposed. Some look for another call, a more powerful call than the written gospel presents. They talk of an inward call, of hearing the voice of God in their souls. But what greater power can the voice of God in the soul have, or what greater power can this inward call have, than the outward call, or the voice of God, echoed by the Apostles? God's voice is only heard now in the gospel. The gospel is now the only word of God, or will of God—the only proclamation and command addressed to the human race. 'Tis in this word of God his Spirit operates upon men, and not out of it. Were the Spirit to lay it aside, and adopt any other instrument, it would be the greatest disparagement of *the word of God*, "which is the wisdom and power of God," "the word of life," and "able to save the soul;" it would be to dishonor that word as men do who prefer other means for converting men to the gospel of Christ.

But let me ask, and seriously ask these inwardly called saints, who have heard some other voice of God than the word of God, What did that voice say? Any thing different from that which is written? If so, how did you judge it? To what standard did you refer it? If it said any thing to you different from what is written, you dare not hearken to it: for the written gospel, Jesus declared, will judge you

at the last day. If it said nothing different from the written gospel, it must have repeated the same, and what was the meaning of repeating it? Does the word of God derive power from a mere repetition of it; or must God, like men, use frequent repetitions to supply the lack of power? Can the voice of God have more power in one language than another—at one time than another—in one place than in another? You cannot answer, Yes. What do you mean by an *inward call?* If there be a word spoken it must be what is written or what is not written. And you must see that either hypothesis issues in that which is inadmissible—in that which is absurd.

Do you mean, with Andrew Fuller, that the Spirit which first gives you life, quickens you without the word? Then I ask you two questions: First, Does it use any means? If you say, *No:* then you contradict universal analogy as well as the oracle of God: for the Spirit was to speak of Christ in doing its work. If you say it uses any means to quicken you, then those means are the principles of life. But then I ask, Have you not, in supposing life infused without the gospel by any other means, deprived the gospel of its character as *the word of life*—as the *living word*—as *living*, and *powerful*, and *effectual*—as the *incorruptible seed?*

But if you have heard a voice simply telling you, *by name*, that you are welcome, remember, I pray you, that that particular call or invitation to you destroys the veracity of God, and makes what is written of no value whatever. For if the general invitation is insincere, if it cannot be relied on, if there must be a particular assurance that you are welcome, that assurance given to you, implies that, without it, you had no assurance before; which would be directly to impeach the veracity of God; yes, his promise, *though signed by his name and sealed by his hand.* The special call, then, is either a lie or it makes the general call a lie. This is where your system ends. And let him who has an ear to hear hearken.

The voice of God, and the only voice of God which you will hear till he calls you home, is his written gospel. This is now the only word of God, the only command and the only promise addressed to all men; proclaimed by his authority to every creature. The gospel is the power of God to salvation, to every one who obeys it. 'Tis in it the Spirit of God exhibits his energy, and he who thinks that the Spirit operates in any other way than clothed in the word of God in convincing and converting the world, feeds upon a fancy of his own, or of some other distempered mind.

I have never yet heard a person attentive to the apostolic writings, never heard a student and practitioner of them, complain of any want of power or energy in them. I have seen and felt their power to be that of the Spirit which endited them, an omnipotent moral instrument in his hand exactly adapted to man. Not physically omnipotent, as in creating something out of nothing; but so morally omnipotent that he who regards them not, could not be persuaded though angels, and spirits, and the dead revived, did appear and speak to them in a language never before heard. It is a mistake, a gross mis-

take, in my judgment, of the means necessary to restore man—a mistake of the nature of the government of God over man, of the actual condition of man, to imagine that any other than *moral means*, than the well attested development of the love of God in the mission and sacrifice of his Son, is necessary to renew the heart of man, to reconcile him to God, and to prepare him for the enjoyment of the friendship and favor of God forever. But this is only by the way. They who talk of a resistible and irresistible voice of God—who talk of a gospel grace common and special, have found a new Bible and a new gospel which I have not seen, nor read, and of course do not understand. The book, commonly called the New Testament, (rather the sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ,) is that from which I have derived my views of christianity, and to which alone I subscribe as the infallible arbiter of all questions touching the word of God, and the salvation of Jesus Christ. The voice of God has, in it, bid me welcome, and my ability to come I find in the welcome which he has given. "The Spirit and the church say, *Come*: every one who hears, says, Come; and Jesus says, Let him who is thirsty, come; and WHOSOEVER will, let him come and take of the water of life freely." In this WHOSOEVER, I have found every letter of my name, and have had as special a welcome as if Gabriel had paid me a visit from heaven.

EDITOR

## EMANCIPATION OF WHITE SLAVES.

MR. BRANTLY has cautioned his slave-holding readers of the *Star* against admitting this work into their territory. He intimates that it may bring ruin to their interests in their slaves. Now, if I could speak to all the slaves on this continent, I would say to them, Be faithful and obedient servants, not only to masters good and gentle, but even to the froward and perverse. I would tell the christian slave to obey his christian master with pleasure and fidelity, because he that obtained the benefit of his labor was faithful and beloved. I would tell the christian slave who had an unbelieving master, to work heartily, as if serving the Lord; knowing that whatever good any man does the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond or free. Paul thus taught me, and thus would I teach them.

But what ruin can this work bring to the interests of the slave-holders? Can it move slaves to sedition? No; for they cannot read it. If it was ever so seditious it can do no mischief to those who cannot read it. Have not those to whom Mr. Brantly *volunteered* this advice, I mean the states in which they live, taken good care, by penal statutes, to punish every man guilty of the sin of teaching a slave to read the life of the Saviour of the world? Mr. Brantly has to volunteer no advice to them to shut from the eyes of these unfortunates the Book of Life. He sounds no caution into their ears upon this subject. But take heed, brethren, how you introduce the Harbinger among you; it may jeopardize your interests in the persons of

your slaves, and in the heavenly inheritance. This the Star will not do. It will aid you in both. It will aid you in keeping your slaves in this world, and secure to you and them the best reception in the next.

It is not for slaves I write. It is not for the slaves of the priesthood, for they *will not* read; and it is not for the negro slaves of the South, for they *cannot* read. It is masters I wish to emancipate. Masters of the South, you will find that I am not visionary on this subject. Nor have I a desire to see you lose one dollar, nor one hour's sleep, nor that you should feel one pang of a guilty conscience, because of your happening to possess servants white or black. The relation of master and servant is older than Abraham, and has been found in all ages and countries, Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian. Even in the Millennium, I presume there will be masters and servants; but every servant is not a slave, nor every master free.

Paul teaches, "To whatsoever you deliver yourselves up as servants, you are the slaves of that which you obey"—yes, you may be more really slaves, than those you designate by that name. The *fear of your slaves* in many instances is master over you. You are in this view the slaves of slaves, while your slaves are only the servants of masters. Is this too paradoxical? Permit me to explain. Many of you in the South are more afraid of your slaves than your slaves are of you. How many masters fear insurrections? how many have to garrison their houses, and awaken at midnight in terror of their own life, and that of their offspring? But where are the slaves who fear assassination, or massacre, from the hands of their masters at midnight? You tremble by night—your slave may fear the lash by day, but he sleeps sound. Of the two kinds of bondage, which is the more difficult to be borne? Your emancipation then deserves our attention; it provokes our sympathy, and with me it is as great a desideratum as that of your slaves.

In Virginia and some of the new states, masters are not yet so much in bondage to their slaves; yet even in Old Virginia, masters are not free from the slavery of fear. So much are they in bondage, that their fears gave birth to the following sections of a bill, which, though strangled in the Senate, had one of a majority in the lower house. Yes, in Virginia an effort was made in February last, to make the following bill the law of the land:

"Sect. 2. *Be it further enacted*, That all meetings of free negroes or mulattoes, at any school-house, church, or meeting-house, or other place, for teaching them reading or writing, either in the day or night, under whatsoever pretext, shall be deemed and considered as an unlawful assembly; and any justice of the county or corporation wherein such assembly shall be, either from his own knowledge, or on the information of others, of such unlawful assemblage or meeting, shall issue his warrant, directed to any sworn officer or officers, authorizing him or them to enter the house or houses where such unlawful assemblage or meeting may be, for the purpose of apprehending or dispersing such free negroes or mulattoes, and to inflict corporal punishment

on the offender or offenders, at the discretion of any justice of the peace, not exceeding twenty lashes.

"Sect. 3. *Be it further enacted*, That if any white person or persons assemble with free negroes or mulattoes, at any school-house, church, meeting-house, or other place, for the purpose of instructing such free negroes or mulattoes to read or write, such person or persons shall, on conviction thereof, be fined in a sum not exceeding one hundred dollars, and moreover may be imprisoned at the discretion of a jury, not exceeding six months.

"Sect. 4. *Be it further enacted*, That if any owner or occupier of any plantation or tenement within this commonwealth, shall establish, or permit to be established, any school or schools on such plantation or tenement, for the purpose of teaching his or her slaves, or those of any other person, to read or write, such owner or occupier shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall be fined in any sum not more than five hundred nor less than fifty dollars, and be punished in the manner now provided by law in the case of other misdemeanors.

"Sect. 5. *Be it further enacted*, That if the owner, master, or overseer of any slave, shall send or knowingly permit such slave to be sent or to go to any Sunday school, or other school, to be taught to read or write, the person so offending shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof, shall be fined any sum not less than ten or more than fifty dollars, at the discretion of a jury: and every teacher of any Sunday or other school, who shall teach, or attempt to teach, or knowingly permit any slave to be taught in such school to read or write, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction, be punished by fine of not less than ten nor more than fifty dollars, at the discretion of a jury; and for a second offence, every such teacher shall be fined in like manner, and may be imprisoned for a period not more than six months, at the discretion of a jury; and moreover give security for his or her good behaviour, at the discretion of the court."

Such is the fear of light, and such is the dread of education in some parts of this good old commonwealth, that *eighty one* of the representatives of the citizens of Virginia, voted for these provisions. What a stupendous monument of the slavery of the whites to the blacks! How unequivocal a demonstration of the fears of some portions of this state of their own slaves! What! *dare* not enlighten their minds! How fearful of the influence of knowledge! This point is conceded without debate, that to the safety and advantage of the whites the ignorance of the blacks is essential. And yet we blame them for being stupid! There are three things on earth which require an ignorant population—or, to change the sentence, there are three things which can thrive only in darkness. What shall we call them? Call them monarchy, hierarchy, and slavery; or kings, hierarchs, and slaves. Hence, to keep up the priesthood, it was necessary to make canons against the laity reading the scriptures; and it is not a century since expounding the scriptures accompanied with singing

and praying by laymen in small societies, was prohibited in some of the English Universities. Kings are afraid of discussing the question of the divine right—the priests are afraid of examining the special call, and 81 of the representatives of Virginia were afraid of the art of reading, or the knowledge of letters being communicated to the blacks in bondage.

But passing by this dastardly provision, pretermitting it as an exhibit of the slavery of masters to the greatest of tyrants, let us take another view of this act from another point of the compass. How does it affect our civil and religious liberty? I do not ask how it affects our character as a civilized or *barbarous* people; but I ask, is it compatible with the spirit of our civil institutions, and our boasted liberty of conscience? Have we any constitutional guarantee of which this is a violation? Have we any fundamental law of which such provisions are a manifest infraction? If we have not, let us talk no more of civil and religious liberty. If our legislators can pass a law in direct interference with our moral and religious obligations, away with our magna charta, and with our boasted civilization!

One of the fundamental laws and principles of our government, is "that the freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic governments." Now, let me ask, what is the meaning of *the freedom of the press?* Does it mean the working of a machine upon type? or does it mean printing in an unknown tongue? or does it mean printing for certain casts of society? To prohibit teaching or learning the art of reading is the most effectual destruction of the liberty of the press which I can imagine. No matter what is printed if it cannot be read; if it be in an unknown tongue. No matter what is printed if it be decreed that men shall not be taught, nor permitted to learn to read what issues from the press. The freedom of the press means the free communication of all sorts of information to all sorts of persons in any community. If it does not mean this, it is *vox et præterea nihil*, sound and nothing else. And if this be its meaning, which no man in the exercise of his five senses can deny, then such provisions are *despotic*, according to our Virginia and American Bill of Rights. But that the legislators have no power to pass such a law, may be shown from various considerations. Let the following hypothesis be duly considered:—

Suppose the General Assembly of Virginia had decreed that all schools for teaching the art of reading should be abolished, and that every man who presumed to teach any literary school should be fined and imprisoned; is there any provision in our Constitution by which such an act could be declared illegal and unauthorized? Not a single provision in our Bill of Rights nor in our Constitution, from which such an act could be declared despotic and wicked, arbitrary and unjust, immoral and profane, that does not in the same interpretation apply to the case before us. Let him who thinks otherwise point to that provision which applies to the one case and not to the other.

But let me ask, has conscience, or a regard to religious obligations, any thing to do in this matter? Are there no persons in the commonwealth of Virginia, who feel any obligation arising from religion to teach such persons in Sunday schools, or any where to read the scriptures of truth? If pure religion in the sight of God be to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction; if it lead to works of charity and mercy; to feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and teaching the ignorant, can we suppose that any christian can be indifferent to the education of his children or servants? Can any man who fears God, who thinks that negroes and mulattoes have souls, and may be happy or miserable forever, have no conscience, feel no religious and moral obligation upon the subject of their education? If there be any such persons in the commonwealth of Virginia who feel such obligation, either to communicate to their own slaves, or to those colored persons not slaves, in their vicinity, in Sunday schools or elsewhere, the knowledge of letters, would not such a law be a direct infringement upon that liberty and rights of conscience which our Bill of Rights and Constitution secure to all persons in the commonwealth?

Again, had a law, prohibiting men preaching the gospel to slaves or free persons of color, been passed by the Assembly, would it be obligatory upon all religious instructers? Had a fine of $500 and six months imprisonment been imposed upon every christian teacher for every free person of color he converts to Jesus Christ, would it be constitutional? Yes, just as constitutional, just as accordant with reason, justice, religion, and the institutions of free government, as the Bill above submitted.

Any law or statute that prevents man from acting morally or religiously upon any fair construction of religious or moral obligation, is not only opposed to the genius of our government and constitution, but is, in its very nature, tyrannical, unjust, and impious. That government which dictates to its subjects how they shall discharge religious and moral duties to their children and servants, differs nothing in *principle* from the most barbarous and sanguinary, from the most intolerant and persecuting governments of the Pagan and Papal world. It may differ in the degrees to which it extends its jurisdiction over the conscience, but in principle it is the same.

For the honor and prosperity, for the peace and happiness of this unfortunate commonwealth, for the sake of suffering humanity itself, I rejoice that this barbarous bill was negatived in the Senate. But the attempt to enact such a law, is proof positive that something ought to be done to emancipate the whites from the fear of the blacks. To this we shall occasionally turn our attention.

EDITOR.

---

*Washington City, March* 23, 1830.

Brother Campbell,

*Dear Sir*—IT seems, from your Christian Baptist, that you are about to commence, or have commenced, another and a larger work, to be called the *Millennial Harbinger*. Well, now, though I differ

radically from your opinions or doctrines, &c. I think I must become a subscriber for this last periodical also. I wish to watch and see what is to be the end of this *new gospel;* or, if you please, of this *ancient order*, as you term it.

You seem to allow me (in your last notice of me) to be, at least, not under the influence of prejudice. This, I assure you, is the fact. Indeed, so far as I can judge of myself, I am prepossessed in your favor. Your able defence of baptism against Walker and M'Calla, and recently the complete route of Owen and atheism, have produced favorable impressions upon my mind. But, sir, under all these partialities, I am more and more compelled to say, that if your view of christianity be correct, I have read and studied my Bible in vain. You say of me, "Although unable to rise above all his early associations, and the long received opinions which a long course of reading and teaching had riveted upon his mind," &c. Now, my dear sir, the act is exactly the other way. My early opinions, my education was predicated upon a system greatly in accordance with your views. In the very first christian lesson ever taught me, I was directed to answer that my name was *Robert*, and that I obtained this name in my baptism, "wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheriter of the kingdom of heaven." As my mental powers expanded I was farther taught to read the scriptures, and pray in private and public; to go to preaching, and to practise moral and religious goodness. So far from being taught to seek for experimental religion, or the attainment of the Holy Spirit, I was constantly informed that this was fanaticism inculcated by the enthusiasts of the day. That a mere belief of the Saviour and of the scriptures, and to practise virtue, were all that were necessary to please God. I not only was taught this system, but I imbibed it and acted upon it above many. I could, in sincerity, repeat the Creed, (called the Apostles' Creed,) and thinkingly say I adopted it as my real belief. The preaching which I heard regularly was also distinctly of this kind. Neither you, nor I, nor any other preacher of the present time, could more plainly inculcate the necessity of believing and reading the scriptures, than the preacher whose ministry I first attended.

Well, sir, I was quite satisfied with my religious attainments, and lived satisfied until I was 20 years old. My present views were the effect of subsequent convictions; and as you admit that you and I can discuss matters without any uncourteous feelings, I will now relate to you how the change took place in my thoughts and feelings. As I said above, I was taught to look upon every expression which claimed the influence of the Holy Spirit, as being enthusiasm, and I acted upon it; I failed not to make light of any thing of that sort advanced where I was. It is worthy of observation that this was really the very subject on which the conversation turned on the day of my conviction. An old disciple was talking very ardently about his conversion. I said to him, What do you mean by *conversion?* Do you think that men can feel the influence of the Holy Spirit now as in ancient times? He paused and solemnly answered, "I do, and that there is no saving

faith without the influence of the Holy Spirit." He went on to quote text after text to prove it, until I became astonished. My first thought was (for I said nothing) a determination to read the New Testament again, with a view to ascertain this point. I did so, and made use of the blank leaves at the beginning and end of the book to note down such texts as seemed to maintain the real operation of the Holy Spirit upon the human heart, &c. This I did that I might turn to them again and examine them closely. The result was a firm belief that, without the influence of God's Spirit directly on my heart, I could not be saved. Well, sir, I sought it—I sought it as a sinner, a justly condemned sinner; and I have found it, thanks to sovereign grace! More than forty years have passed off since, during which time I have labored to correct my errors and to search for truth. The effect of this forty years' examination is a conviction, amounting to assurance, that the Holy Spirit begins, and carries on, and finally completes the work of salvation. Indeed, how can I believe otherwise? It is the sheet-anchor of my tempest-toss'd soul. It is the light of my eye, and the strength of my heart. My own spirit groans and grapples in the dark until God's Spirit helpeth my infirmities and beareth witness with my spirit that I am a child of God. This, my friend, is no matter of speculation. It is a foundation truth that must stand sure. If this could be destroyed, I know not what the righteous would do. God has sealed his own people with the Holy Spirit of promise. God's word is the production of God's Holy Spirit. It is equally true that his work is also.

Why should it be thought a thing incredible that the Holy Spirit is active as the efficient agent of man's salvation? He moved upon the face of the waters and formed creation. Shall the greater work of salvation be effected without him? An arm almighty was necessary to make atonement for sin and to bring in an everlasting righteousness for man. Will it not require an almighty arm to apply the atonement, and to make the death of the Son of God effectual, "that of those which his Father had given him none should be lost?" God's word is a precious treasure, but it is precious because the Spirit opens our understandings that we may understand the scriptures. *Without the Spirit* the word would be a *dead letter*, as it really is to thousands who have it in their hands. God honors his word by accompanying it with his Spirit. It is the Spirit that makes it sharp and two-edged. Without it the word neither cuts nor pierces. If the world has been standing not quite 6000 years, as some say, then nearly half that time it was without the written word; yet doubtless many thousands (I hope many millions) went to glory without the word. The Spirit made direct revelations to their souls, and pointed them through a long vista to an expected Saviour. Do I, then, make void the word? God forbid! Yea, I establish the word. It is because the Spirit of God sustains it that it is more stable than heaven and earth. To conclude, my brother, show me thy faith wrought by the word, and I will show thee my faith wrought by the Spirit through the word.

When I began I meant to write a short epistle, somewhat explana-

tory of your paragraph respecting me. I've lengthened it out. Be it so. Take it, and let it go for what it is worth. Perhaps you may hear from me again upon other points.

Dear brother, the above contains some hasty effusions on some points in which we differ. I have not even copied them; yet I believe I will venture to let them go for what they are worth, either into your old or new publication. You have the advantage of most men in point of style; but if any discussion should take place between us, I hope it will be with a sole view to elicit truth, and not for mastery. I hope also it will be accompanied by prayer and a holy temper.

Yours affectionately,

RO. B. SEMPLE.

---

## REPLY TO ROBERT B. SEMPLE.

BROTHER SEMPLE,

*Dear Sir,*

THE arrival of your letter when the copy for this number was nearly completed, prevents me from paying so minute an attention to it as I would have done had it been received at an earlier day. I think I told you when parting in Essex, that if you and I should never approximate nigher to each other in our views, I would nevertheless still love and esteem you as a christian—as a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. Since parting with you I have found this affection and esteem increase; and your letter before me is a new excitement to the cultivation of all brotherly kindness and charity. It gives me pain to have to differ in a single opinion from one whom I venerate so highly; and glad would I be if I could say a hearty *Amen* to every sentiment in your letter.

One consolation I have, that you and I believe all the same gospel facts. We believe every fact which Paul called "the glad tidings," viz. that "*Jesus died for our sins;* that he was buried; and that he *rose the third day* according to the Scriptures." Nay, we are equally assured of all facts in the gospel history, and consequently are of *one faith.* I do not think there is one historic fact in all the testimonies of the four Evangelists in which our faith is not the same. We are not only of *one faith*, but we agree in *one immersion* also. You say that we are buried with Christ in immersion, and raised with him; and that *in this act we put him on.* We do not differ in the *one Lord*—in the *one God*—in the *one body*—in the *one Spirit* which animates that *one* body; and in the *one hope* of a glorious resurrection from the dead. In some points of view we differ on some of these unities; or, rather, we view them with more or less distinctness and force. We pray to the same God and Father, through the same Lord and Saviour, and by the same Holy Spirit. In a word, we agree in a thousand things, constituents and connectives of the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian ages of the world. But we differ in the strength or weakness—in the latitude or longitude of our conceptions of some

matters and things connected with, or proceeding from, the seven unities.

You are pleased to commence with the good old catechism of the church of my grand father. I was taught the Westminster "*Larger and Shorter;*" but "when I became a man I put away childish things." Well now, brother Semple, there is, as a Vermont Telegraph says, the *refraction* of some great truth below the horizon of the Episcopalian world in this very answer. And you and I both agree in the proposition that neither the "Church of Rome" nor "the Church of England" has lost all truth; I agree with both of them in many items, and so do you. Had you not been sprinkled, and had you been a believer of the testimony which God gave of his Son before you were baptized, I would not much dissent from the answer which you were taught to give to that question. These circumstances, however, alter the case very much. The sprinkling of a speechless and faithless babe never moved it one inch in the way to heaven, and never did change its heart, character, or relation to God and the kingdom of heaven. But not so a believer, immersed as a volunteer in obedience of the gospel. He has put on Christ; and whatever belongs to the husband belongs to the wife: "You are Christ's property, and therefore *all things* are yours." You and I agree that we have righteousness, or pardon; that we have all the blessings of salvation through Christ; that his blood cleanses from all sin; and that the reign of God is righteousness, peace, and joy in a holy spirit. The question is, *At what instant of time do we enter this kingdom, or come under this reign of God, and by what means?* I say, the moment we vow allegiance to the King in the constituted way—the moment we are naturalized—the moment we are born of water and the Spirit—the moment we put on Christ—the instant we are *converted*, and not before.

It was, you say, upon the face of the waters that the Spirit first moved in creating. It is upon the face of the waters the Spirit still moves in recreating. Jesus himself came by water before he came by blood. It was while wet with the waters of the Jordan, the Spirit descended upon him. Thus the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, agreed in one testimony concerning him. You have referred to the Spirit moving upon the waters—I refer to the New Testament allusions. I do not, however, argue from them, save allusively, to this subject. No; it depends upon a plainer, a more literal, a positive testimony. Please examine again my essays upon immersion.*

The question between us is not whether the reign of God is not righteousness, peace, and joy in a holy spirit; but the question is, Do we come under that reign, or enter that kingdom, *before* or *after* immersion? This is the single question which embraces all the ground about immersion. After the most minute, patient, devout, and long protracted examination; after hearing all objections, and examining them with care, I am more and more confirmed in the conclusion to which I had come in my debate with Mr. M'Calla in 1823. I will,

*Christian Baptist*, vols. v. vi. vii.

however, examine, and regard, with all attention, whatever you may please to offer upon that question which embraces the whole subject.

The next point, and the remaining one in your letter, is what refers to the operation of the Holy Spirit. You favor me with what you suppose to be a correction of a mistake into which I had fallen concerning your early reading and teaching. I am much pleased with the narrative which you give, though it does not relate to what I had in my eye in the remark quoted. I did not mean that period of your life from childhood to twenty, so much as the early part of your public life as a preacher and teacher. This, however, is a small matter. Your narrative is an interesting one, and worthy of attention.

It is strange to the unreflecting and inattentive observers of the human mind in all its developments, what different conclusions men will arrive at from the same premises; and with what tenacity they do adhere to them from the supposed sincerity and honesty by which they have arrived at them.

About the same year in your life and mine, I began to examine most diligently the holy scriptures on the work of the Holy Spirit. I took your course, I noted down the passages, and have to this day upon the blank leaves of a Testament many references still extant. I had received an education different from yours in many respects; more evangelical as you would call it. From the age of *sixteen* I read devoutly, at intervals, the most "*evangelical* writers. I bought *Baxter's Call to the Unconverted* and *Allen's Alarm*, that I might be converted, hearing them highly commended by the pious. Boston's Fourfold State, Newton's, Bunyan's, and Hallyburton's Memoirs, and all the converting books were sought after and read with avidity. The accompanying influences of the Holy Spirit, were prayed for most ardently on these and other works, as well as on the holy scriptures. After I had hope that I was converted, and differed much from those mere moralists of whom you speak, who called prayer and devotion, except in a stone house denominated a church, "*fanaticism:*" I say, after I hoped that I had passed from death to life, I began to examine this subject, and with the aid of the great and "evangelical Dr. John Owen." He was a great favorite with me, I read most of his works, and, with especial delight, his "*Christo Logia*," or "the Person and Glory of Christ;" his "Death of Deaths in the Death of Christ," the strongest work against the Arminians I ever read; his Treatise on Independent Church Government; and, above all, his work on the Holy Spirit, in two large octavos. This work I ate up. I wrote it off in miniature on two quires of paper, in order to make my own of it. Not a verse that mentions the *Holy Spirit* which he does not take notice of. I was thoroughly imbued with his systematic illustration of it. Other works of his I also read; but this became a text-book. So that I was, at the age to which you allude, perfectly indoctrinated into the right faith, as the evangelical christians called it. I think I informed you once before how laboriously and extensively I had examined the question of faith. For the space of one year I read upon this subject alone. Fuller, Bellamy, Hervey, Glass, Sandeman,

Cudworth, Scott, M'Lean, Erskine, *cum multis aliis*, were not only read, but studied as I studied geometry. And I solemnly say, that, although I was considered at the age of twenty-four a much more systematic preacher and text expositor than I am now considered, and more accustomed to strew my sermons with scores of texts in proof of every point, I am conscious that I did not understand the New Testament—not a single book of it. Matthew Henry and Thomas Scott were my favorite commentators. I read the whole of Thomas Scott's commentary in family worship, section by section. I began to read the scriptures critically. Works of criticism, from Michaelis down to Sharp, on the Greek article, were resorted to. While these threw light on many passages, still the book as a whole, the religion of Jesus Christ as a whole, was hid from me. I took the *naked text* and followed common sense; I read it, subject to the ordinary rules of interpretation, and thus it was it became to me a new book. Then I was called a *natural* man, because I took the *natural* rules of interpretation. Till then I was a *spiritual* man, and a *regenerated* interpreter. But, alas! as I learned my Bible I lost my orthodoxy; and from being one of the most evangelical in the estimation of many, I became the most heretical. I can only say for the spirit which actuated me, that it was a most vehement desire to understand the truth. I did most certainly put the world out of my sight. I cared no more for popularity than I did for the shadow which followed my body when the Sun shone. I valued truth more than the gold of Ophir, and I sought her with my whole heart, as for hidden treasure. My eye was *single*, as King James' Translators said. I paid no court to the prejudices of the world, and did sacrifice every worldly object to the Bible. This much of my experience and history I deem due to you for the narrative you have given. I would only add, that experience has taught me that to get a victory over the world, over the love of fame, and to hold in perfect contempt human honor, adulation, and popularity, will do more to make the New Testament intelligible, than all the commentators that ever wrote.

But, brother Semple, I do not claim any regard or authority to my conclusions from an argument drawn from those premises. No; I appear before the public with the Bible only in my hand. What I cannot evince and demonstrate to be the mind of the Holy Spirit from that, my experience, or my labors in pursuit of truth, will not be plead as any evidence in favor of its truth; for in discussing the views of others I will not allow an *argumentum ad modestiam* (an argument addressed to my modesty) to have any weight.

I differ not from you in the conclusion that the Holy Spirit begins, carries on, and consummates the salvation of men. But the question is, whether independent of, accompanying, or simply by *the word of life*? Much has been said upon this subject already, and much may yet be said about it before the speculations of the dark ages shall be banished.

In the mean time, I must close this response for the present, not fearing to let your letter stand without a full examination till my next.

The remarks in this number on the 8th chapter of the Romans, and on *the Word of God*, written before yours was received, embody much matter pertinent to your letter. To these in the mean time I refer you and my readers.

I have long thought that the best way to understand the work of the Holy Spirit, is, to take every sentence in which it is named, one by one, and, in the light of their respective contexts, decide their import. When you attempt this, or have done it, you will find no text supporting the views of Andrew Fuller's previous holy disposition infused anterior to faith. This idea, sometimes called *sovereign grace*, is the radix of the system, and of the religious metaphysics of this age.

You speak of the Holy Spirit bearing witness with your spirit. *Do you mean in any other way than by the written word?* I had a long conversation in Richmond with a Methodist teacher on this subject. He claimed some sort of a witness in the heart from some suggestion of the Spirit attesting his conversion. The "Holy Spirit witnessing with our spirits that we are children of God," I understand to be the concurrence of the testimony with our own experience. But of this again.

In the mean time, brother Semple, be assured that my views of the Institution of Jesus are antipodes to that cold, formal, moral, lifeless system, in fashion in Old Virginia in the tobacco age. The result of the gospel when obeyed, according to my proclamation, is, "righteousness, peace, and joy in a holy spirit." And for you and all the saints, I can pray with Paul, "The favor of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all. Amen!"

In hope of immortality, yours,

A. CAMPBELL.

*April* 2, 1830.

## EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER

*To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger, dated*

"MATTHEWS COURT HOUSE, Va March 8, 1830.

——"AND first, what is meant by the remission of sins in the first of Mark, where John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins? From the plain reading of the passage, I should suppose that, by the baptism which succeeded their repentance, they obtained the remission of sins; yet these very persons were again immersed. You would contend for the remission of their sins after the kingdom of the Messiah was established on earth. What sins could they have been conscious of if they had opened their eyes with dawning light, and walked in the paths illumined by the rising Sun of Righteousness. Though I have imperfectly expressed my ideas, you will see the point at which I aim; and if it would not take too much time, I wish you would give me your opinions on it."——

"I think I have abundant reason to thank the Lord that I ever saw your writings, or had the advantage of your personal acquaintance and instructions. It has given an entirely new turn to my ideas, and I believe divested me of prejudice and bigotry, with which I found myself considerably tainted. I have felt more true happiness since I have viewed the testimony of God as incontrovertible, than I did before. Many a gloomy and melancholy hour did I before spend, when my feelings alone were the grounds of my hope. Often it was suggested to my mind, Would not the Bible believed have the same effect on an individual if all that is there revealed were a fable; and sometimes I have been almost driven to the position I once heard a pious divine taking, that, "if false or true, it was better to be on the safe side of the question." I am already branded a "*Campbellite*," and from the various reports and downright falsehoods which have been circulated about your immersing me, I think it will take testimony well authenticated before I can ever again believe any thing bad about you. They have driven you completely on the vantage ground. A majority of the members of the Baptist church in this place are favorable to your *Christian Baptist*, though none can go the whole length with you. Some who, when I first came home, were strenuously contending for the old Calvinistic doctrines, have entirely changed, and as strenuously advocate the side of reason and truth; receiving, of course, the appellation of fickle, turncoat, &c. We had for a short time meetings of discussion, which were well attended and very profitable to us, and would probably have continued, had not a neighboring clergyman come to preach for us, by whose advice they were turned into prayer meetings, which shortly ended them."

"We have lately been visited by an acquaintance of yours, of some note, brother *James E. Welch*, who is employed by the Sunday School Union to establish Sunday Schools through the state. He established two in this county. Approving of the institution, I lent my aid to its support. As usual we were all well milked to support this national object, though the people were not very charitable. But the doctrines he preached were such as I never again wish to hear. You probably have heard him on the same subjects: "*the New Birth*," and "*What is Truth?*" What little I understand of Calvinism and Fullerism I have derived from hearsay, never having read any thing on the subject. He appeared to give us the doctrines in their purity, while preaching from the last text; making the word of God of no effect whatever, unless God, by his sovereign distinguishing grace, was pleased to convert their souls and enable them to believe the record he has given of his Son. This is what he preached, if I understood him; and in private conversation I understood him to say the same thing—that the inducements in the sacred volume were not sufficient to reconcile men to God; and in the present state all, without one exception, would prefer the road to death, were it not for this distinguishing grace of God. Another truth was the perseverance of the saints; this you know is a favorite doctrine of the Baptists, and many of the members seemed to feed on it as the bread of life. I staid two nights

with him, and in the various arguments we had I was more than ever convinced that the ground you have taken with regard to faith is impregnable. How can men, sensible men, who on other subjects exercise their reason, on *this* so far lay it aside as to preach these doctrines, and in the next breath exhort sinners to repent and believe on God, and say, "Whoever will, let him come to the waters of life, and drink freely?" I think there is more need of following brother Clopton's advice here, and by fasting and prayer supplicate the Lord to restore to their right reason his *gospel ministers*, than there is to prevent this 'most deadly influence of *Campbellism*' from overflowing us.

"With regard to creeds I am not fully satisfied. Could you commune with a Unitarian? And if he is immersed, without a creed or some other discipline than the Bible, how could you exclude him from the Lord's table? These objections were brought to my mind soon after I embraced religion. I came to the conclusion that a creed was necessary for this purpose, nor do I to this day see how we can get over them if it is an essential to believe in a three-one God. Happily we are not troubled with Unitarians in this part of the country; but if one were to present himself at our table, I should feel at a loss what to do. Do be explicit on this point.

"My time has been principally devoted to the study of the New Testament, both in the original and your new version; this last has assisted much in understanding it. I thought it my duty to do all I could to promote the gospel cause; and it was my intention to become what is called at the present day a preacher; but if I were to attempt it I hardly know what to say; the way appears sufficiently plain; and I am satisfied that many by their teaching bewilder the mind and throw objections in the way; and I almost fear to begin lest I should do wrong and add to the number of impediments." N.

---

[Many items have been excluded from this number to make room for Messrs. Clopton, Clack, and Semple, and the replies to them. That to Bishop Semple is only begun. The extracts from the letter from Matthews are published without the knowledge or consent of the author. This is known to be my habit when the public interest may be promoted, and when not strictly enjoined to the contrary. Touching the forgiveness of sins connected with John's immersion, I can only refer him to the last essay on the Jewish Age, C. B. vol. 7, p. 220. The forgiveness subsequent to John's immersion was like the other Mosaic institutions for the forgiveness of sins committed while as yet the first constitution or covenant was standing—it was the forgiveness of the Jewish age. This institution Paul affirms made no man perfect as respected the conscience. I might as pertinently be asked, Why should those persons who had obtained forgiveness at the altar, have been baptized by John, or by the authority of Jesus? as, Why should those whom John immersed be immersed into the faith of Jesus?

On the subject of communion with Unitarians, and of the inefficacy of creeds to prevent the evil here feared. I must request this brother to read my essays on creeds in the previous volumes of the Christian Baptist. But it is in contemplation to submit an essay in the next number, pointing to the means by which we shall have no Unitarians at all. This will be the better way of solving this difficulty. I think I can promise an essay in demonstration of the practicability of such a state of things.] EDITOR.

## PULPIT ELOQUENCE.

THE following extract from a correspondent in Richmond, Virginia, affords a fair sample of a considerable part of the pulpit exhibitions in some sections of this country:—

"OUR dear old brother K. took as a text in the forenoon, the 16th verse of the 4th chapter of Matthew; he, however, spoke on the first clause of the text, leaving the remainder for the night lecture. The text was, "*The people which sat in darkness saw a great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up.*" A preacher who was a stranger was present in the morning, and heard the discourse, thought perhaps he could give us a few brief ideas on the latter part of the text, and accordingly walked up into the pulpit; and on being asked by brother K. if he would preach, agreed. He arose; and, to the astonishment of all present, took the part left in the morning. I thought myself perhaps he was "apt to teach," and one subject was just as convenient as another. He commenced without much introduction, and boarded the text; there was, however, a considerable clearing of the throat:—

"My friends," said he, "you had an exposition of the fore part of the text this morning, and it falls to my lot to give the balance to-night. "The people which sat in darkness saw a great light." Now John the Baptist was the first man that ever preached the gospel in all the world, and he wore a curious dress for it had camel's hair on it; and he had a girdle on his body or waist for to girdle up his loins, so he might be strong in the Lord; and he lived on locust and honey which was for to eat; and the people all went out of Judea for to see him in Jerusalem, and all the regions all over the world; and he baptized them for the confession of their sins; and Jesus went down to the river for to be baptiz'd, and John woul'nt baptize him, for he said he ought to baptize him; but he suffered it to be so, that he might fulfil the righteousness of Christ. And the Pharisees came to John also like vipers for to be baptized, and he told them to go away and bring their fruits, that a new light was sprung up. And Jesus was about this time twelve years old; and he was found in the Temple, and was talking with the lawyers of common law, and civil law, as well as physical law. And now we will proceed with the text, more particular where the child was for to be born. Perhaps I a'nt got sense enough to explain; but I will tell you what you never heard before: I was called for to preach, and I dont get paid for preaching, so I dont preach for money; but I come a good ways to preach about this gospel which was for to lighten up the Gentiles; then they which were enlightened as it were, see their Father like a glass darkly. Now this gospel is the wheel upon which salvation turned: and they are all brought out of the regions of death. Now Moses the great lawgiver studied philosophy, and sciences, and military, and he was not eloquent, and no more I am not eloquent; but I must go and preach. Now Jonah was asleep you all know when he was in the ship, and there was such a fuss made about him, and he might as well ha' jump'd out at first, for he know'd he'd have to go at last. But they throwed him over, and he was swallowed up with the wale; and he carried him up to the top of the mountain and vomited him out, and great light sprung up. There was another text in scripture which was a very good lustration of the idea itself, about the prodigal son, when he was all the way from his father's house, this light sprung up to him also; and now I must close this discourse, as the evening gets later, though I could say a greadeal more about it."

DYDIMUS.

## *SOVEREIGNS OF EUROPE.*

GEORGE IV. king of England, is 67 years of age.

Charles X. king of France, is 72, and the oldest reigning sovereign in Europe, except two.

Nicholas Paulowitz, emperor of Russia, and King of Poland, is 33 years of age. His queen, Alexandrina Wilhelmine, of Prussia, is of the same age, having been born on the 13th of July, 1796, and her husband the 2d of that month.

Ferdinand VII. of Spain, is 45 years old. His neighbor, the interesting Don Miguel, king of Portugal, is but 27 years old. There is room for him to grow better as he grows older.

Mahmoud II. sultan of Turkey, is 45 years old.

William Frederick, the king of the Netherlands, who is to decide the Maine boundaries, is 57. His queen's name is Frederica Wilhelmina Louisa, and she is sister to the empress of Russia.

William Frederic George Louisa, prince of Orange, is 37. He is married to a sister of the emperor of Russia, the lady whose jewels have been stolen.

Francis I. emperor of Austria, is 51 years old.

Louis Charles Augusta, king of Bavaria, is 73.

Frederick VI. of Denmark, is 61.

Frederick William III. of Prussia, is 59.

Charles Felix, king of Sardinia, is 64.

Frederick Augustus, king of Saxony, is 79 years of age, and the oldest reigning sovereign in Europe.

Charles John, king of Sweden, is 65 years of age.

Joseph Francis Oscar, prince royal of Sweden, is 30 years old, and is married to Josephine Mamimillience Eugenia, 22 years old.

Francis I. king of the two Sicilies, is 72 years old, and married to a sister of the king of Spain.

William, king of Wurtemburg, is 43; Paulina Theresa Louisa, queen of Wurtemburg, is 29 years old.

M. De Wise is burgomaster of the city and republic of Zurich, President of the Federal Directory of Switzerland.

[*Republican Compiler.*]

## *RELIGIOUS SECTS.*

THE number of Roman Catholics in the United States is greater than that of any *one* Protestant sect. It is at this moment considerably more than 600,000. The Methodists are more numerous than any other Protestant sect, whose exact numbers are given, amounting to 421,000. The Calvinistic Baptists have 4000 *churches*, but the number of communicants does not appear: we shall estimate them at 350,000. The Presbyterians number 154,297 members. The orthodox Congregationalists, 115,000. Unitarian, 150 congregations.—Episcopal churches, 598. German Reformed, 30,000 members.—Evangelical Lutheran, 800 congregations. Christian Society, 1000 churches. Friends, the whole number estimated at 750,000—but they are divided into *two* parties, differing very widely. Besides, this

number includes a great many who are only Quakers in their parentage, and perhaps their dress. Universalists, 300 congregations. Free-Will Baptists, 335 churches. A dozen other sects number variously, from a few hundreds to 20,000 each. *N. H. Observer.*

[Were either the Methodists or Baptists to calculate as the Catholics, either of them I apprehend would greatly excel the Catholics in number. They would at least amount to 900,000.]—*Ed. M. H.*

## UNIVERSALISM AND ATHEISM.
### *AS EXPECTED.*

SOME of the most prominent Universalists in the country have recently avowed their attachment to the doctrines of *Frances Wright, R. D. Owen* & Co. In the last number of the Buffaloe Patriot we notice an advertisement of the Free Enquirer, by Mr. *O. A. Brownson,* in which he says—

"Mr. O. A. Brownson, known to the public as a Universalist preacher and editor of the Gospel Advocate, has relinquished the charge of that paper; and, as corresponding editor of the Free Enquirer, has opened for it an office at Auburn, Cayuga county, N. Y.—Mr. Brownson invites those of his former readers who love truth better than creeds to follow him to the Free Enquirer."

## *MONTHLY RECEIPTS for the MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

Samuel Cox paid 2 dollars. J Gaskill, New Lisbon, Ohio, paid for R P Philips, 2 dollars. G Williard, J Alcut, J Cownover, and D Gow, 1 dollar each. N Adams, Germano, Ohio, paid 1 dollar. F O Sutton, White Chimneys, Va. paid for H Coleman and R Pare, $2 each. J Bryant, Hopkinsville, Ky. paid for S Wilkinson, Cadiz, 2 dollars. W Galliard, Middleburg, Ohio, paid for W Pangburn 2 dollars. Isaac Smith, Columbia ⋈ Roads, Pa. 2 dollars. P S Bush, Falmouth, Ky. paid for himself 2 dollars. M H Jones, Newtown, Va. paid 2 dollars. T Edwards, Lebanon, Tenn. for G Waters, New London, Mo. $2. T Bell, Lexington, Ky. paid 2 dollars. R M Batson, Millersburg, Ohio, paid for G M'Kim, J Miller, T Throckmorton, T Eads, and himself $1 each. B A Hicks, Lexington, Ky. paid $2 for Clifton Thompson, W B Sims, Cuckooville, Va. paid for Dr. M Pendleton and O C Smith, 2 dollars each. J Mendal paid for S Hedge and Thomas Wier, Wellsburg, Va. A Shallenberger, Mount Pleasant, Pa. paid 6 dollars. W D Carnes, Pikeville, paid to W Randal 2 dollars. W Poston, Winchester, Ky. paid for himself, T Faulconer, and H Jacobs, 2 dollars each. J Pearson, Newark, New Jersey, paid by C Loomis, Petersburg, Va. 2 dollars. Mrs. Mary T Craft, Somerset, Pa. paid for N M Bruce, A Morrison, and C Forward, Esq. 2 dollars each. W Cole, Wilmington, Ohio, paid for himself and G M'Mannis, two dollars each. John Jeffries, Wellsburg, Va. paid 2 dollars for himself. J Ficklin, Lexington, Ky. paid for Dr. James Fishback, S Taylor, J H Randolf, and J Schooly.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

{ No. 4. } BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1830. { Vol. 1. }

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## MILLENNIUM.—*NO. II.*

WILL sects ever cease? Will a time ever come when all disciples will unite under one Lord, in one faith, in one immersion, in one hope, in one body, in one spirit, and in adoring one God and Father of all? Will divisions ever be healed? Will strife ever cease among the saints on Earth? To these questions all who pray for the millennium, all who long for its appearance, answer, *Yes.* How, then, shall the union be accomplished? Will all be converted to any one sect? Will all become Unitarians, Trinitarians, Arians, or Socinians? Will all become Presbyterians, Baptists, or Methodists? Will all become members of any one of the hundred sects of this century? I presume no person of common intelligence will say, *Yes.* All sects know they have some opinions, or some customs, which must be dispensed with. How then shall it be introduced? I answer unequivocally in one sentence, By abandoning opinions, and founding all associations upon the belief of gospel facts. Let every sect give up its opinions as a bond of union, and what will remain in common? The gospel facts alone. Every sect, Catholic and Protestant, admits all the historic facts recorded in the *five* historical books of the New Testament. Their various interpretations, additions, subtractions, and new modifications of opinions concerning these facts, and not the truth or falsehood of the narratives, create all the confusion, build the whole Babel, and set all the machinery of the contending interests in motion. Now, will not the slowest to apprehend see that, if, by any means, they could be induced to abandon their opinions, and retain the plain incontrovertible facts, the strife would be over?

But men cannot give up their opinions, and, therefore, they never can unite, says one. We do not ask them to give up their opinions—We ask them only not to impose them upon others. Let them hold their opinions; but let them hold them as private property. The faith is public property: opinions are, and always have been, private property. Men have foolishly attempted to make the deductions of some great minds the common measure of all christians. Hence the deductions of a Luther, and a Calvin, and a Wesley, have been the rule and measure of all who coalesce under the names of the leaders. It is cruel to excommunicate a man because of the imbecility of his

intellect. I have been censured long and often for laying too much stress upon the assent of the understanding; but those who have most acrimoniously censured me, have laid much more stress upon the assent of the mind than I have ever done. I never did, at any time, exclude a man from the kingdom of God for a mere imbecility of intellect; or, in other words, because he could not assent to my opinions. All sects are doing, or have done this. Their covenants and creeds are deductions, speculative and abstract, from the crucible of some strong skull, and those who would not or could not subscribe them as the oracles of God, have been given over to Satan. The Baptists are doing this now, in many parts of the country, with an unrelenting hand.* They will make a sect, another sect, if they can. But they will not be able to make a sect of those who advocate the ancient order of things; provided they who are now contending for the gospel, will be true to their own cause.

I will now show how they cannot make a sect of us. We will acknowledge all as christians who acknowledge the gospel facts, and obey Jesus Christ. But, says one, will you receive a Unitarian? No; nor a Trinitarian. We will have neither Unitarians nor Trinitarians. How can this be! Systems made Unitarians and Trinitarians. Renounce the system, and you renounce its creatures.

But the creatures of other systems now exist, and some of them will come in your way. How will you dispose of them? I answer, We will unmake them. Again I am asked, How will you unmake

*Instances of this are occurring every day. The following are now lying before me—

"*Carey County, Ky. February* 19, 1830.

"The Baptist church of Christ at Mount Vernon, holding the principles of the General Union, dismiss brother C. H. Trabue, not in full fellowship, for his stating, in his preaching, that he believes the Old Testament law is fulfilled and of no more power over the sinner, and that both saints and sinners are now under no other law but the law of Christ—and also, without the liberty of the church, hearing of experiences, and baptizing in the bounds of a church.

"*First Saturday of November*, 1829."

"WILLIAM PAYNE, *Clerk.*"

"*Philadelphia, March* 27, 1830.

"There is a stir in the third Baptist Church in Philadelphia. O. F——— has been cast out of the synagogue, for maintaining and propagating the principles of the ancient gospel, and for having independence enough to think and act for himself in the great concerns of immortality. *Of course other causes are alleged.* Others of the brethren, it is expected, will, at the next meeting, be sentenced by the sanhedrim, (viz. priests and deacons,) to have their names cast out as evil: they are cited to appear and show cause why they should not be, agreeably with the directions of the *little book.*

"These brethren have united and formed an apostolic church, under the name of "The New Testament Congregation of Immersed Believers," (I think this is their title.) They acknowlenge nothing but the New Institution, and meet every Lord's day for breaking bread, and brotherly exhortation. They say they enjoy much more spiritual comfort, and are abundantly more edified in this way, than in listening to the dry essays of the *textuary.* May the Lord send them prosperity, and greatly multiply them, until this little one becomes a thousand, and until their fruit shakes as Lebanon."

them? I answer, By laying no emphasis upon their opinions. What is a Unitarian? One who contends that Jesus Christ is not the Son of God. Such a one has denied the faith, and therefore we reject him. But, says a Trinitarian, many Unitarians acknowledge that Jesus Christ is the Son of God in a sense of their own. Admit it. Then I ask, How do you know they have a sense of their own? Intuitively, or by their words? Not intuitively, but by their words. And what are these words? Are they Bible words? If they are, we cannot object to them—if they are not, we will not hear them, or, what is the same thing, we will not discuss them at all. If he will ascribe to Jesus all Bible attributes, names, works, and worship, we will not fight with him about scholastic words: but if he will not ascribe to him every thing which the first christians ascribed, and worship and adore him as the first christians did, we will reject him, not because of his private opinions, but because he refuses to honor Jesus as the first converts did, and withholds from him the titles and honors which God and his apostles have bestowed upon him.

In like manner we will deal with a Trinitarian. If he will ascribe to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, all that the first believers ascribed, and nothing more, we will receive him —but we will not allow him to apply scholastic and barbarous epithets to the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit. If he will dogmatize and become a factionist, we reject him—not because of his opinions, but because of his attempting to make a faction, or to lord it over God's heritage.

And will you receive a Universalist too? No; not as a Universalist. If a man, professing Universalist opinions, should apply for admission, we will receive him, if he will consent to use and apply all the Bible phrases in their plain reference to the future state of men and angels. We will not hearken to those questions which gender strife, nor discuss them at all. If a person say such is his private opinion, let him have it as his private opinion; but lay no stress upon it; and if it be a wrong private opinion, it will die a natural death much sooner than if you attempt to kill it.

In illustration of this most interesting point, I beg leave to introduce a narrative which justifies the course here recommended, and presents it, in a very eligible character, to the advocates of the ancient order of things. —

In the year 1828, when the gospel, as taught by the apostles, was proclaimed with so much power, in the Western Reserve, Ohio, by our brothers Scott, Bentley, Rigdon, and others, some of all sects obeyed it. Among these some Methodist and two Universalist preachers were immersed for the remission of their sins. One of these Universalist preachers appeared at the Mahoning Association, held in Warren, in the month of August, 1828. He was invited to deliver an oration, at an early period of the session of the Association. He did so. Many of the brethren heard him with great pleasure; but some—remembering that he had, only a few weeks before, proclaimed Universalism, or some species of Restorationism—could not be altogether reconciled to invite him to a seat, and to treat him as a brother.

Indeed, some worthy brothers were intent on having a motion made, calling upon this brother Rains for an unequivocal declaration of his opinions upon the Restoration scheme, to which he was suspected by some as still partial. It was intended, by some members, to non-fellowship this brother, if he avowed these principles. Some opposed this measure; but finally brother Rains arose, and in a very clear and forcible manner, and with all deference, declared that, when he obeyed the gospel, he had, as he thought, virtually renounced sectarianism, and did not expect that the disciples of Christ were to judge him for his private opinions. It was true, he said, that many of his former opinions remained. These opinions he did not wish to inculcate; but if he were asked to avow his private opinions concerning his former peculiarity, he must confess that he was substantially of the same opinion still.

This greatly alarmed some of the brothers, and they were prepared either to renounce him, or to withdraw from the Association, if he were acknowledged. Some of us made a proposition that if these peculiar opinions were held as PRIVATE opinions, and not taught by this brother, he might be, and, constitutionally, ought to be retained; but if he should teach or inculcate such private opinions, or seek to make disciples to them, he would then become a factionist, and as such could not be fellowshipped.

Whether he held these views as matters of faith, or as pure matters of opinion, was then propounded to him. He avowed them to be, in his judgment, matters of opinion, and not matters of faith—and, in reply to another question, averred that he would not teach them, believing them to be matters of opinion, and not the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Although a majority of the brethren were satisfied, still a number were not reconciled to this decision. It was repeatedly urged that it mattered not what his private opinions were on this subject, provided he regarded them only as matters of opinion, and held them as private property.

I urged this course from the conviction that, if these opinions were not agitated nor discussed, the ancient gospel would cause them to wither away. This was my philosophy then, and, being much pleased with this brother, I had no doubt, from his very handsome address and acquirements, he would be a very useful laborer in the great field. I only heard of him a few times since; but the other day I received the following letter from him, which, I think, proves the wisdom of the course pursued, and goes far to recommend the principles contended for in this article.—

"*Cincinnati, April* 13, 1830.

"DEAR BROTHER,—Being aware that you are often addressed through the medium of letters, and that the multiplicity of engagements which call for your attention, render brevity a necessary qualification in your correspondents, I will, in this communication, be as brief as possible.

"I wish to inform you that my "Restorationist" sentiments have been slowly and imperceptibly erased from my mind, by the ministry

of Paul and Peter, and some other illustrious preachers, with whose discourses and writing, I need not tell you, you seem to be intimately acquainted. After my immersion, I brought my mind, as much as I possibly could, like a blank surface, to the ministry of the New Institution—and by this means, I think, many characters of truth have been imprinted in my mind, which did not formerly exist there. I also consider myself as growing in grace, and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, every day—and as I give myself wholly to the work of an evangelist, I have, within the last twelve months, been instrumental in disseminating the truth extensively, and in removing from many minds, some heavy masses of sectarian rubbish. The facts of the New Testament will conquer the world. They have conquered me, and are now conquering thousands of others. The reformation is progressing in almost all parts of the Western Country through which I have travelled, beyond my most sanguine expectations.

"My former associates persecute me, I would say, most cruelly. I hope you will not permit them to prejudice your mind against me. I shall have many difficulties to encounter, in consequence of the evil circumstances which formerly surrounded me—or, to speak more plainly, in consequence of having once been a Universalist. I, however, hope to rise above the opposition of my quondam brethren, and during the remainder of my days, to devote my energies, not to the building up of sectarian systems, but to the teaching of *the word*.

"I should be very happy to hear of the welfare of father Campbell. I am strongly disposed to reciprocate the kindness of that beloved brother, by declaring, that, if I were *Timothy, father Campbell* should, in preference to any man, be my *Paul*. You will not call this flattery. It is a warm sentimental effusion of my heart.

"AYLETT RAINS."

It is in accordance with a liberty which I sometimes take, when I think the good cause requires it, that I publish an extract from a private letter. This has been known to be my failing; I hope it leans to virtue's side!

To return—I hope I may be permitted to say that I feel a certainty amounting to assurance, that this is the only practicable course to usher in that glorious day of union, peace, and love, which all desire, and many expect, to be the discriminating character of the Millennial age.

Reason and experience unite their testimony in assuring us that, in the same proportion as individuals labor to be of one opinion, they disagree. The greater the emphasis laid upon opinions, the more rapidly they generate. The nearest approaches to a unity of opinion which I have ever witnessed, have appeared in those societies in which no effort was made to be of one opinion; in which they allowed the greatest liberty of opinion, and in which they talked more and boasted more of the glory and majesty of the great facts, the wonderful works of God's loving kindness to the children of men, than of themselves, their views and attainments.

I am greatly deceived in all my reasonings, and observation has misled me, if any society pursuing the principle we have suggested, will ever be troubled with Unitarians, Trinitarians, Universalists, Arminians, Calvinists, &c. &c. and under such a course of procedure as that recommended here, all will see that such systems and such schismatical tenets could never originate. If I were to attempt to produce the greatest uniformity of opinion, I would set about it by paying no respect to opinions, laying no emphasis upon them, admiring and contemning no opinion as such. But if I wished to produce the greatest discrepancies in opinion, I would call some damnably dangerous, others of vital importance; I would always eulogize the sound, and censure the erroneous in opinions. We all know that strife is like the bursting forth of water—it always widens the channels; and many a broil in churches, neighborhoods, and families, would have been prevented if the first indication had been sympathetically attributed to the infirmity of human nature.

EDITOR.

*From the Religious Herald.*

## CRITICISM.

IN the Christian Baptist, volume 7. page 164, is the following criticism:—

"Disciple or convert the nations, immersing them. I need not tell you (says the writer) that this is the exact translation. Let me ask you then, Does not the *active* participle *always*, when connected with the imperative mood, express the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed. *Cleanse* the room, *washing* it; *clean* the floor, *sweeping* it; *cultivate* the field, *ploughing* it; *sustain* the hungry, *feeding* them; *furnish* the soldiers, *arming* them; *convert* the nations, *baptizing* them—are exactly the same forms of speech." And again: "That was the act [namely baptism] by which the command to convert the nations was to be obeyed. Like or dislike the import of this sentence (adds the writer) it must unquestionably be admitted by all scholars and persons of plain common sense to be the unsophisticated meaning of it."

Now I must venture (notwithstanding this assertion) to call in question the correctness of this criticism: not that I wish by any means to depreciate the ordinance of baptism; but because I consider the matter not properly represented.

"Does not the *active* participle *always*, when connected with the imperative mood, express the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed?" I answer, No; not *always*. It frequently does so; but sometimes (and particularly in condensed sentences) it expresses another action;—a part, indeed of the general order or command, but distinct in its nature from the particular thing enjoined in the imperative mood. Examples in which the participle *does* express the manner of performing the command in the imperative mood, have been given as above quoted: let me subjoin one or two sentences,

of similar construction, in which it does *not* express the manner of performing that particular command.

"Go and *inspect* the army, *furnishing* all the soldiers with arms and provisions." "Go and *count* that flock of sheep, *marking* every one in the ear." Now the active participle *furnishing* does not express the manner of performing the particular order to *inspect;* nor does *marking* express the manner of *counting.* They express, in both instances, two distinct things,—two different acts, both being included in the general command:—inspect *and* furnish; count and mark.

Now try the case in question—the commission in Matt. xxviii. "Go and teach (*matheteusate*) *disciple or convert* all nations, baptizing them in the name," &c. Does it follow, from this form of expression, that the active participle *baptizing* expresses the manner in which the command to *disciple* or *convert* is to be performed? I should think not. And as far as regards the particular manner in which the sentence is constructed, I am not forbidden to say, they are two distinct things—both included in the general order or command:—disciple or convert *and* baptize Nothing in the construction of the sentence forbids it; and upon the most candid examination, I am well persuaded that this is indeed the correct idea—"the unsophisticated meaning" of the sentence. Let us pay some little attention further to the matter.

Since the mere construction of a sentence in this form will not decide the question, whether the participle is intended to express the manner in which the act enjoined in the imperative mood is to be performed, or whether it expresses a distinct thing, we must resort to some other *datum* for that purpose. What is that *datum?* I answer, simply this: *the nature of the case.* We are to judge whether or not, *in the nature of the case*, the action in the participle is that by which the thing enjoined in the verb is to be performed. This, and not the mere form of the sentence, must enable us to decide. Hence the corollary stated by the writer, is not a legitimate one. "This was the act (he says, deducing it from the very form of the sentence) by which the command to convert the nations was to be obeyed." It does by no means follow.

Now, then, we are on other ground than the mere construction of the sentence; and it remains to form our judgment on *this* question. Is baptism or immersion, in the nature of the case, the act by which a person is discipled, turned to Christ, or converted? Is this the true, "unsophisticated," scriptural idea of the fact? I think not. That baptism appertains to the character of a disciple or convert, I readily agree. Nor do I deny that the apostles would have refused to recognize, as a disciple, the professor who should have refused to be baptized;* this ordinance being the appointed badge of discipleship, the proper mode of manifesting or professing allegiance to the "King of saints." All this, however, admitted, it does by no means follow, that baptism really constituted discipleship; or in other words,

*As they probably would also the church member who should have *rejected* the Lord's supper.

is that by which a person is converted to God: nor does the New Testament, as far as I am capable of judging, any where represent it. *Conversion is a turning of the heart to holiness, by "repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ,"* this repentance bringing forth "fruits meet," and this faith "working by love." Baptism (or sacred immersion,) according to the order of our Lord's kingdom, *ought* to be a prompt and early fruit of discipleship; and but for the unhappy influence of human tradition, and the blindness of prejudice, surely every one, desirous of sustaining, properly the character of a disciple, would follow his Master in the way which he has appointed.

The construction contended for by Mr. C. in the criticism, is this: "Convert the nations, baptizing them," &c.—that is, convert them by baptizing. The construction which I maintain, in these remarks, is this: "Convert the nations, baptizing them in the name," &c.—that is, convert and baptize them:—a construction which appears to me much more congenial with scriptural representation in general; and particularly with the commission as recorded by Mark, "He that believes *and* is baptized," &c. and with that passage in John iv. 1, (which the writer of the critjcism surely must have overlooked)—the Pharisees heard that JESUS MADE AND BAPTIZED more DISCIPLES than John." One sacred writer is the best commentator on another. CHRISTIANOS.

P. S. Mr. Campbell is respectfully requested to give these remarks a place in the Christian Baptist. He can animadvert on them as he may think proper. C.

## REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

MUCH as I may respect the writer of this criticism, and his ingenuity too, I can give him no credit for the above criticism. I spoke of *natural* participles, not *forced participles*, or rather not imperative moods forced into participles. He either mistakes the whole criticism, or not liking the plain meaning of the passage, tortured his imagination to find something for which there is no parallel in any writer who understands the English tongue. He invents two exceptions to a rule as general as any rule in the English syntax. Yet neither of them is in truth an exception. Let us examine his first example. "Go and inspect the army, furnishing all the soldiers with arms and provisions." To convert this example into good common English, it reads thus; Go, inspect the army and furnish all the soldiers with arms and provisions. He wishes the actions to *inspect* and to *furnish* to appear different. No scholar then could find any reason for using an imperative mood for the one, and a participle for the other. And I will go a little farther and say that no Grecian, Roman, nor English writer of any standing whatever, ever used such an expression. I will thank Christianos to bring from any standard writer in these languages only one example like this, his invented anomaly.

But I have not done with it yet. Let me ask him to give us a reason for adding *ing* to furnish. Is not the modification of this sentence which I have given the natural, grammatical, and the *universal* usage? I have said *universal*, believing it to be as difficult to find an exception as to find a black swan. There are three natural imperatives—three *commands* in this example perfectly distinct from one other. The first command is, *Go*—the second command is, *inspect*, and the third command is, *furnish*, different from the other two. Now why add *ing* to the last, more than to the former two, if not to make a case to suit him. For no other assignable reason!! It is making a new language—a language too new to improve the Augustan Age. Why not have read it thus; *going, and inspect, and furnish*, or *go, inspecting, and furnish*. There is as much propriety in either of these, and as much authority for them as for his converting a natural imperative into a participial form to save a private opinion.

His second example is from the same mint. They are two bullets made in the same mould before the metal cooled, "Go and count that flock of sheep, marking every one in the ear." Why not have had the *three imperatives* according to the sense and design of the injunctions? Why not have spoken it in English thus; "Go, count that flock of sheep, and mark every one in the ear?" Does he mean that marking them in the ear is expressive of the manner of going and counting them. No, he will answer. Why then add *ing* to the last imperative? for it is, he says, a *distinct command, and surely ought to be a distinct imperative*. If it is not a distinct command, then it does not suit his purpose in bringing it forward, and if it be a distinct command, surely it ought to be a distinct imperative. This dilemma, if he understand it, leaves not a wreck of his examples behind.

But his theology is as exceptionable as his grammar. We shall try it. He has *ingeniously* formed these two examples to suit not only his *forced participles*, but his views of the commission. Go and convert the nations, *baptizing* them. With him these are distinct imperatives, or distinct commands. For this is his side of the question. If *distinct commands*, they ought to be *distinct imperatives*. So will decree all the colleges in christendom. If they are distinct acts, distinct commands, they must be distinct imperatives. It ought on his hypotheses to read, "Go, convert," or Go, disciple, and baptize the nations. This is his sense of the passage. He has three distinct imperatives, and would force the participle into an outlandish imperative. It is, Go, disciple, and baptize. I ask then, Does not his baptizing import something different from discipling? Pray what is it? In good English, or in bad English, let us have what he means by baptizing, after a person is discipled. To plough, to harrow, and to sow a field, are all distinct acts, and we may say, "Go, plough, harrow, and sow such a field;" but not Go, plough the field, harrowing it, or Go, plough, and harrow the field, sowing it. It would be tolerable English to say, "Go and plough the field, and harrow it, sowing it," if it was intended to sow it at the same time. But in no other sense would it be tolerable.

His examples are no exceptions to my rule, for they do not come under it. His rule is this—The active participle is sometimes an imperative mood when in conjunction with other imperatives expressing different commands and different acts. By juxta position, it becomes an imperative!! This is his criticism. It has the merit of novelty. I go upon this old and plain principle of grammar, that the imperative mood is the commanding mood, and that in giving commands for every distinct command, we use a distinct imperative. If there be two or three, or four distinct commands in one address, there must, in all grammatical reason, be just as many imperatives, as there are distinct commands. To convert participles into imperative moods is only necessary when there is some unreasonable position to be carried. Thus in time of war it is *right*, not only to destroy the country, but to cripple, wound, and even kill the inhabitants.

There may be many participles added to one imperative to express the manner of conforming to the command—not one of which, however, indicates any act, but an execution of the command given. The first chapter which I read after reading the criticism of my friend Christianos, was the fifth to the Ephesians. In which I observed *four participles* in sequence of one imperative. In the Greek Testament it reads *be filled with the spirit.* This is the command, and it is in the imperative mood of course. The participles are *speaking*, *singing*, *praising*, *giving thanks.* Be filled with the spirit, *speaking* to one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, *singing* and *praising*, or making melody in your hearts to the Lord, and *giving thanks* on all occasions to the Lord. In this manner the command given in the imperative, "Be filled with the spirit," was to be obeyed. But why should I specify when there is not a more general principle in the grammar of universal language.

Christianos, no doubt, felt very confident that he had found two exceptions; and is confident that the words "*Jesus made and baptized more disciples,*" was a point blank refutation of the idea that baptizing had any thing to do with making disciples. Now had it read, *Jesus had made more disciples and baptized them*, it would have been a little more specious; because it would have seemed that the disciples were finished and made before baptized, and baptizing was something very different from making disciples. But this false rumor, in the current language of Judea, that "Jesus made and immersed more disciples than John," is corrected by the historian in the following parenthesis, (though in fact Jesus immersed not: his disciples only immersed.)

It is the common custom in the colloquial style of all nations, in describing some results, to repeat all the acts by which a thing is done. John cut out, sewed, made, and completed more shoes than any cordwainer in town. William raised and finished more houses than any mechanic in the city. To make and baptize or disciple, is no more than equivalent *to disciple a person.* Put a question, which will settle this matter, remains to be discussed. Is an unbaptized

person any where called a *disciple*, or a *brother*, or a *convert*, after the institution of christian immersion in the New Testament? Can any one be called a disciple who is not in the school of that teacher whose disciple he is called? A disciple is the scholar, or the follower of some person. "*The disciples were called christians first at Antioch.*" No person can in christian propriety of style, be called a disciple who is not baptized. We use the term laxly when applied to those who profess Christ, and who think they are baptized, when in fact they are not. But this is *our* custom—not the apostles' custom. Christ's command is, Disciple or convert the nations, immersing and teaching them. And *without instructing and immersing*, the command cannot be obeyed. It never was obeyed in any other way. Hence, the apostles first preached, then immersed those who believed, and taught them the christian institution.

Notwithstanding our friend Christianos has given us a new *datum* for understanding participles, we must with additional earnestness, and with more force, press upon our readers the corollary as a most legitimate one, viz. this act of immersing was an act without which the command to convert the nations was not obeyed.

One of the most ruinous improvements in christian theology, as I think, is the making of conversion what Christianos makes of it—"*a turning of the heart to holiness.*" Mental converts are only speculative converts. Philosophical converts they may be, but christian converts are persons whose lives are changed—who are turned from the practice of sin to the practice of the doctrine of Christ. True, they do love truth, goodness, holiness; but they show this love by obedience. Many of these *mental converts* need to be converted in the scriptural sense of that word. To many of them I would say, "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out."

In one sentence, I am for purity and holiness of life in all disciples; and in making disciples, I go for the old usages—for proclaiming the gospel—for immersing the believers for the remission of sins; and then after they are thus converted, for teaching them to observe all things which the Lord commanded. And if Christianos has discovered any other or better way, it is his own, and I have no right to it. I trust the learned will either refute, or cordially adopt my remarks upon this participle.

As I have now republished Christianos in these pages, I hope he will make interest with the Religious Herald to let my remarks in reply to his criticism, go in the same columns to his readers.

EDITOR.

---

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Mr. Editor,

I PERCEIVE, in the third number of the Baptist Chronicle, the letter written by the church in Frankfort (or rather by Dr. Noel,) to the Franklin Association; and although I doubt not you will notice it as it deserves, yet there is one matter connected with it that you,

perhaps, are not aware of; but to which the public attention should, in my opinion, be directed.

I have observed (and it has often amused me) the pains taken to enlist the prejudices of the public in favor of certain men, and against others. It is supposed that the weight of great names does wonders in any cause where argument fails. It would seem though that the defeat these gentlemen sustained in their calling of Bishop Semple to their aid, should have taught them better. But our religious politicians are just like the politicians of this world. They imagine they can dupe the people into any thing. It matters not what course they *have pursued*, if they can only keep the public mind off from that, and make them think that they are *now* the champions of their cause; the "blushing honors" of popular applause they know will "fall thick upon them."

The Baptist Recorder, during its existence, was wont to bespatter those who wrote for its pages, with epithets well calculated to secure for their essays a full share of attention. The Baptists have been taught to believe that there exists "an odious conspiracy" against their very existence, and especially their *name*. If, therefore, "a Baptist *of the old stamp*" appears, he is sure of a patient hearing.

I see, too, that the Chronicle is about to follow its example, and to appeal altogether to the passions and prejudices of its readers; and if I should judge from the communications contained in it, as well as from its editorial flights, this is all it can aspire to.

Brother Clack is, indeed, a man of some attainments; and I have regretted exceedingly to see him duped by artful and designing men, of whose character he knew nothing, to place laurels around their brows at the expense of truth and righteousness.

But to the point. I have been led to these reflections by observing a question, precisely of the character above alluded to, in this famous Church Letter. And I am the more disposed to notice it, since the celebrated Mr. Henry Wingate has been pleased to say that the reason for shutting the doors against the brethren Creaths, is to be found in that letter—namely, *they are identified therein*.

I presume the gentleman above alluded to, having been chosen door-keeper for the House of Representatives, felt himself so highly exalted above his usual sphere by the appointment, that he supposed he could, with impunity, aspire to the honorable office of door-keeper, to a house built by the new recruits; and consecrated to holy purposes with all due form and solemnity; and, therefore, without any order from the Church, could give to the public just what documents he saw proper from amongst her papers.

The question I refer to is the following. After giving the items of false doctrine, charged upon Mahoning by Beaver, and adding some others of a most indefinite character, the Doctor asks, "Can any *real Baptists* abide it?" And in all the fury with which his theme inspired him, he gives to all neutrals, all *unreal Baptists*, their furlough.

Now, whenever any man claims to himself very exalted pretensions, the public, and especially if there are any among them who have good memories, (the possibility of which demagogues always choose to forget) have a right to be informed upon the validity of this claim.

I have, therefore, a question to propose, upon which it is hoped this same Doctor Noel will be pleased to afford us some information:—

*Is Dr. Noel a Baptist, or is he a Presbyterian?*

Laugh not, gentle reader, at the apparent folly of such a query. Dr. Noel was once a *Presbyterian Baptist*; and that but a few years ago; and I desire to know whether he is any thing else *now*. He was no *real Baptist* at the time alluded to, the *real Baptists* themselves being judges; since a venerable old *real Baptist* declared, publicly, that the Doctor only raised the dust I am about to advert to, *that he might throw the real Baptists into confusion*, and slip out of the dilemma in which they held him, unnoticed. *He* was once a reformer, a "restorationer," and the reason that has induced him to change, is now sought for, if, indeed, he has changed, or has any reason for it.

It is well known that after Dr. Noel first started as a preacher, he raised a considerable commotion among the Baptists by the "doctrines" he delivered and the worldly course he pursued. He was at length appointed Judge by Governor Slaughter; but after he had exercised his talent for a time (with a view, no doubt, to the profit and honor of him who gave it) it was found that the Senate would not allow him to administer justice to the good people of Kentucky.

He then devoted himself exclusively to the practice of the law, and continued in this career for some time.

At length a motion was made in the Church in Frankfort, of which he was a member, to call upon him to assign his reasons for not having preached for some years past. It was agreed that the call should be made, and Dr. Noel informed the Church at their next meeting he would give his reasons for his course.

Now came the bustle. A general convocation of all the neighboring clergy was summoned; publications were made in the papers; great excitement prevailed; the people came flocking together to hear what reason could possibly be assigned why a professed Christian should prefer the bench to the pulpit.

When the day arrived a manuscript of many pages was presented. It was too long to read it all at one meeting; the excitement, too, it was necessary to keep up. The people had not yet decided whether the Doctor were a man of talents or no; and the decision of this question was, I have since understood, the object of all the ado.

If I am not mistaken, and I trust the Doctor will correct me if I am, he gave as reasons for having desisted preaching:—

1. That he was not satisfied of his call to preach.

2. That he was not settled in his doctrinal views; and that if he had continued in the pulpit he should have preached what he now found to be untrue. And,

3. *That he was dissatisfied with the government of the Baptist Churches.*

As it respects the two first points I have nothing now to say; but concerning the last, have just to remark that, in the views the Doctor delivered, and the "*reformation*" (an old brother said it was *revolution*) he proposed, he was decidedly opposed by all the old and long established *real Baptist* preachers who took part in the discussion. Among these were the brethren Taylor, Hickman, Cook, and Scott, and others whom I do not now recollect. He was, however, seconded by his present able coadjutor in opposition to the truth, *George Waller.*

Many other preachers were invited to the meeting; some of whom refused to attend, looking upon the whole as a mere manœuvre of the worthy Doctor.

He maintained that the Baptist government was altogether too inefficient; that there ought to be ruling elders in the churches; and that Associations should have appellate jurisdiction over the churches; in short, sir, *he came out a full-blooded* PRESBYTERIAN.

Now the object I have in view, as already stated, is, to request of the Doctor information upon the matter. Is he *really* a Baptist, or a Presbyterian?

He may, for aught I know, have changed "*his views of what the Scriptures teach*" on this matter. Will he, therefore, distinctly say if Romans xii. 8.] 1 Cor. xii. 28. 1 Tim. v. 17. *now* teach that there should be ruling elders in the churches, as he contended, they did *then?* These passages were as plain then as they are now. If they taught Presbyterianism then, as the Presbyterians believed Doctor Noel had proved, they teach it now. If Doctor Noel believed what he then said he did, he must have had *good* reasons for it; and if he does not now believe what he then did, he must have *better* reasons for the change—if, indeed, he be a reasonable man, which some doubt.

If, too, Doctor Noel is now *really* a *Baptist*, a "*genuine Baptist*" a "*Baptist of the old stamp*," and not a reformer, a "restorationer," a *revolutionist*—a Presbyterian and no Baptist, as was there said by those opposed to him; he can certainly give his reasons why he then wrote and acted as he did—or why he has changed in his "views of what the Scriptures teach," concerning the alleged inefficiency of the Baptist government.

Pardon me, sir, for this intrusion upon your time; (I trust the Doctor will pardon it; but I thought it right that the Baptists should distinctly ascertain if Doctor Noel be a *real Baptist*, or a Presbyterian—if he has any creed at all, or ever had.

Yours, &c,

QUERENS.

FROM THE COLUMBIAN STAR AND CHRISTIAN INDEX.

*Charlotte Court-House, Va. March* 23, 1830.

## STRICTURES ON THE PREFACE TO THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

### *NO. I.*

*Matt.* vii. 16. "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"

PREFACE, page 1. NO one can reasonably claim the attention of the public, unless he is fully persuaded that he has something of sufficient importance to offer. When so many writers are daily addressing the religious community, it may, perhaps, be demanded why another should solicit a reading? When so many religious papers are daily issuing from the press, why add another to the number? To these and similar queries it may be answered, That of all the periodical religious papers of this day, with which we have any acquaintance, but a very few are of an independent character. They are generally devoted to some one or other of the religious sects which diversify the devout community. So much so, at least, that being under the control of the leading members of the respective sects, under whose auspices they exist, and to whose advancement they are destined, they are commonly enlisted in the support of such views and measures as are approbated by the leaders of each sect. And such must every sectarian paper be."

*Remarks.*—THE ostensible plea, here urged for the origin and publication of the Christian Baptist, is the want of independency of character in other periodicals, sufficient to guard them from the influence of sectarianism. And according to this *professed* plea, each of the devout sects, and supporters of sectarian periodicals, were authorized to expect in the columns of this paper, a candid, impartial, and christian view of their various sentiments, christian forbearance and tenderness in regard to their supposed errors; christian candor and liberality in respect of their merits; and in all respects, a clearer exhibition of that mind which was also in Christ Jesus, than was seen or professed in themselves. Whether this reasonable expectation has been realized, will be more fully developed in the prosecution of this examination. To issue a religious paper, on the ostensible and plausible ground that all, or nearly all others, were so much under the controlling influence of sectarian leaders, as to forbid the hope that, in them all the truth, and nothing but the truth, would be exhibited and defended; and then to direct the operations of that paper in such a style and spirit, as must inevitably result in the formation of another new sect more discriminating in its peculiarities, and more intolerant in its spirit, than those which it labors to reform or destroy, cannot, in the judgment of intelligent and reflecting christians, be regarded as christian ingenuousness. But that this has been the course and tendency of the Christian Baptist, is now so evident as to need no further proof. It is true, that those persons who have adopted the peculiar sentiments of the Christian Baptist, whether they were originally Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, or Methodists, have not *assumed* to themselves the significant appellative, *Campbellites;* but they are now as generally distinguished, and as well known by that name, as are the admirers of Calvin and Wesley, by theirs. And although they may have thrown away to the moles and to the bats, as so much unintelligible and mystic jargon, what are tauntingly and contemptuously called, by them, the dogmas of Calvin, Arminius, Gill, and Fuller; they now contend as earnestly and perseveringly for the doctrines and sentiments of the Christian Baptist, as they formerly did for those which they have recently renounced. All this has been done, and the work is still in progress, under a professed design of destroying that pernicious sectarianism, which has diffused itself through the various ramifications of the Christian community, marred its peace, and deformed its beauty. Our Lord, in one of his inimitable discourses, speaks of certain persons who "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." Whether this may be applied to them, is left to their discriminating and candid judgment to determine.

*Preface.*—"We now commence a periodical paper pledged to no religious sect in Christendom; the express and avowed object of which is the assertion of truth and the exposure of error, as stated in the Prospectus. We expect to prove whether a paper perfectly independent, free from any contolling jurisdiction, except the Bible, will be read; or whether it will be blasted by the poisonous breath of sectarian zeal and an aspiring priesthood."

*Remarks.*—An exemption from sectarian influence is again reiterated, with a declaration that the Bible only is to exercise a controlling jurisdiction in moulding and directing the views and measures of this *truly* anti-sectarian paper. The Bible as interpreted by those who control their views and measures is the acknowledged standard of all those who publish religious periodicals. Whether, therefore, the interpretation of the Bible, as exhibited in the Christian Baptist, more accords with the will and mind of Christ remains yet to be proved. The bold assumption, however, seems to prefer a claim to much higher degrees of knowledge; and a greater assurance of infalibillity, than are professed in other religious periodicals. The paragraph as it quoted, seems evidently to imply, that the interpretations of the Christian Baptist are to be free from error; its sentiments so liberal, so free from partiality and sectarian influence, that should any one dare dispute its claims; refuse to adopt its creed; or undertake to oppose its progress; he must breathe "the poisonous breath of sectarian zeal, or belong to an aspiring priesthood." If the Christian Baptist should cease to excite the admiration of the world, lose its patronage, fail in its grand object, and like others sink into the shades of a dark oblivion; let it not be imputed to the absence of extraordinary merit in itself; let it not be supposed that its object was unworthy, and its contents the emanations of an erroneous judgment; or a bad heart; rather let it be concluded that it was "blasted by the poisonous breath of sectarian zeal, and of an aspiring priesthood." It will not be doubted by *modest* men, that these pretensions are sufficiently lofty, while anticipated opposition, is marked with a resentment pointed, strong, and bitter as death. The following text is one of great importance, and perhaps much too seldom weighed by most professors. Rom. ii. 1. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." The term "priesthood" in this connexion is not particularly defined; but it is believed that it will clearly appear in the course of this examination, that it is applied contemptuously, and reproachfully, to all those ministers, as well Baptists as others, who believe themselves to have been called of God, to the work of the ministry; have submitted to be ordained by a Presbytery, and who are unwilling now to renounce their sentiments on this subject, and adopt those of the Christian Baptist. In view of the rise and progress of the Baptist denomination in these United States, almost entirely through the instrumentality of ministers of this description, united with the consideration of their patience of hope and labor of love, while, in many of them, holiness to the Lord was written as it were upon their frontlets, and marked their footsteps; it is not very easy to submit patiently and meekly to such taunts, coming too from a professed disciple. All will admit, however, that acrimonious, invective, and reproachful epithets, are much more easily obtained than sound and conclusive arguments, and that christian candor and humility, after which all should aim in religious controversy. When the term Priest was applied, appropriately to Mdlchisedeck, to Aaron, and to the godly of his order, and to one infinitely superior to them, it was an epithet of distinguished honor. Since the death and ascension of the Lord of glory, it is appropriated exclusively to HIM who is called the High Priest of our profession. If, then, it be applied as a term of reproach of the ministers of the present day, though they claim it not, they must seek a shield from the obloquy in the recollection that those ministers who have evidently most resembled our Lord Jesus Christ, in the different ages of the gospel church, must share with them the gratuitous contumely. As Baptist preachers, though far distant from them in point of merit, we may think of the Ganos, Baldwins, Furmans, Mercers, and Marshalls.

*Preface.*—"Had the well meant remonstrances of Luther; Calvin, and Wesley, been acknowledged and received by the sect to which they belonged, the mother would have been reformed, and the children would have lived under the same roof with her. But they would not. They were driven out of doors, and were compelled either to build a house for themselves or to lodge in the open air."

*Remarks.*—If Luther, Calvin, and Wesley had succeeded in reforming the several churches or sects from which they finally seceded, they would not have been compelled to set up an independent standard and organize a new sect. But their remonstrances failed; and consequently a new sect, in each case, was formed. This, though at first not well understood, wears the aspect of a prophetic threat; and in its fulfilment, facts abundantly justify the following referential interpretation. If the Baptist Church will acknowledge and receive the well-meant remonstrances to be published in the Christian Baptist; if they will renounce their attachment to a regular ordained ministry, and admit that no man has been moved by the Holy Ghost to preach the gospel since the days of the Apostles; if they will admit that what they have all this time regarded as *experimental* religion, is a mere delusion of the Devil, or the enthusiastic whims of a disordered brain; if they will admit all to baptism and fellowship in the church, who say no more than that they believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; if they will renounce their old Bibles, and adopt the new translation of the Testament, with the whole creed of the Christian Baptist; then the daughter (the Campbellites) will live with them under the same roof. But if they will not be *thus* reformed, the daughter, being opposed to all sectarianism, and in purpose, fixed to maintain her own sentiments and views, free from and against the controlling influence of all sectarian leaders, will suffer herself to be driven out of doors, build a house for herself, or lodge in the open air, and erect the standard for a new sect. Accordingly in more churches than one, the line of demarcation has already been drawn. Aged ministers whose grey hairs are still their crown of glory, have lived to be reproached as textuaries and Priests by those who once owned them as fathers in the gospel. While envy, with her serpentine tongue, has spread discord and revenge amongst those who once regarded each other as brethren; and sectarian jealousy has kindled a fire, to be quenched by death alone. The new sect is formed; houses have already been built; and no doubt others are in contemplation. All this has been accomplished, too, through the instrumentality of a paper, *professedly* anti-sectarian in all its principles and objects; and urging as with a thousand tongues, that sectaries and sectarianism are the bane of the Christian Church. It cannot be improper to repeat here. "By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"

*Preface.*—"The price of this paper is such as must convince all who reflect, that it cannot be a lucrative scheme."

*Remarks.*—In this proposition it is taken for granted, that the Christian Baptist carries in its very front, as it were, indubitable evidence of its disinterestedness and pure benevolence, or at any rate, that the *love* of filthy lucre had no share in its origination—no controlling influence in directing its operations. When it is considered that the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; that man, in his best estate, is prone to selfishness; and so very propense to this species of selfishness, that, in the Bible, the love of money is pronounced to be the root of all evil; a declaration of this kind, when made, ought to be sustained by evidence sufficiently conclusive to gain the ready assent of every good man's heart, and to extort it from the base and suspicious. What is the evidence in this case? A bare declaration, that for a very small work a very high price is not demanded. But this declaration happens to be made by the Christian Baptist, which assumes the conflicting offices of judge, jury, and witness; a witness too deeply interested. And as it is a point of great importance in ascertaining and fixing the credibility of its testimony in other cases hereafter to be discussed, and as conviction pre-

supposes examination, it may not be impertinent to quote in anticipation, another proposition from the 12th page of the Preface. "We have learned one lesson of great importance in the pursuit of truth; one that acts as a pioneer to prepare the way of knowledge; one that cannot be adopted and acted upon, but the result must be salutary. It is this; *Never to hold any sentiment or proposition as more certain that the evidence on which it rests; or, in other words, that our assent to any proposition, should be precisely proportioned to the evidence on which it rests. All beyond this, we esteem enthusiasm, all short of it, incredulity.*" This proposition, so concise, so easy to be understood; so extensive in its bearings and so various in its application, is cheerfully introduced to aid in the decision not only of the present case, but will be regarded as an auxiliary pioneer; through the pending examination. The price of the Christian Baptist is little,—one dollar only, for 12 numbers; therefore, the love of money cannot have had any share in its origin.

On page the 6th are the following conditions: "For a year or two, until this work shall have established its own character, each number shall contain 24 pages duodecimo, published on the first of Monday every month, at 1 dollar per annum, exclusive of postage, to be paid on the delivery of the first number." For 288, or at most 300 pages duodecimo, one dollar is to be paid in advance. It has claimed the patronage of 4000 subscribers. So that however free from the love of filthy lucre its scheme may have been, its gain, provided the claim to patronage be just, must have been equal to four thousand dollars a-year, including necessary expences. The first number was issued in 1823; but from the conditions as quoted above, it is self-evident that a greater work was then in contemplation. It was then supposed that the Christian Baptist would establish its own character in two years at most. This expectation was not realized. However, in the seventh year, this greater work is issued under the title of the *Millennial Harbinger*, at the moderate price of two dollars a-year if paid in advance; or two dollars and fifty cents if payment be delayed. Thus for twelve numbers. each containing about the same quantity of matter as one number of the Columbian Star and Christian Index, which is a weekly paper. amounting to 52 numbers in the year, at precisely the same price—*two dollars* are required. If the patronage has been increased, which may be fairly presumed, as the Christian Baptist must have established its own character by this time, the Millennial Harbinger must draw within its benevolent grasp something more than eight thousand dollars a-year. Besides this immediate efficiency in the money way, the Christian Baptist must let the public know that there was to be a new translation of the New Testament, at its office; that the Debates with Walker and M'Calla were there ready for sale; since then, that with Owen; and, in addition to all, a volume of pure hymns.

*The Proposition.*—"The price of this paper must convince all who reflect, that it cannot be a lucrative scheme," was written while all these matters were passing in lively perspective; and reflecting men are called upon, in front of this evidence, to *believe* that the idea of gain was far away; that the love of filthy lucre never once insinuated itself into any secret chamber of the heart; never gave the smallest momentum to the wonderous scheme. If assent to the proposition should be precisely proportioned to the evidence on which it rests —can it be criminal to suspect of enthusiasm those who belive it? Can they be considered criminally incredulous who find it impossible to assent to it?

*Preface.* "There is much less diversity in the views, passions, prejudices, and circumstances of mankind, as respects the true religion, in the different ages of the world, than at first thought we would willingly admit. Who is there that has attentively considered the history of Cain and Abel; of Noah and his contemporaries; of Moses and the Egyptian magicians; of the Lord's Prophets and the Prophets of Baal; of Israel's true and false Prophets; of the Lord of life and his disciples, with that of the religious sects of the day; of the present advocates of primitive christianity in Europe and America, and of the supporters of the popular systems of this age;—I say, who is there that, having con-

sidered such histories, will not be astonished at their remarkable coincidences, striking similarities, and concurrent contexture of events?"

*Remarks.*—The phrase, "the supporters of the popular system of the age," is conceived to form an exception to the general import of the paragraph: otherwise it bears the impress of incontrovertible truth, and affords a striking illustration of one of the most important features in the religion of the Bible. It is believed to result necessarily from the unity of the Godhead and of his purpose—the changeless obligation of the creature to his Creator—the nature of sin and holiness—the one name alone, Christ Jesus the Lord, through which man can be restored to holiness and to God—the oneness of that church, to which Christ is made head over all things—which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all. Whence also results the conclusion, that *true* religion, however the outward forms of expressing it may have been varied, according to the appointment of him who imparts its principles and requires their outward manifestations, in different ages and under different dispensations, has always been *essentially* the same. Hence from Abel down to the present day there have been strong resemblances not only between the righteous themselves, but between many of the external circumstances and events with which they stood connected. In every age and under all circumstances they have been actuated by similar principles, and drawn by similar motives, to worship the living and true God. While in the ungodly, the carnal mind, through a love of sin and an aversion to holiness, has constantly rebelled against the Most High God. Dr. Owen, a Pedobaptist, and one of the most learned and pious men of the age in which he lived, attended the preaching of John Bunyan, an illiterate Baptist preacher. In listening to the doctrinal, experimental, practical, heart-searching sermons of Bunyan, the classical scholar and the learned divine forgets his own greatness, and that himself and the preacher were of different sects—regards him as a servant of the Lord, and is willing to learn even from him more perfectly the knowledge of Christ and him crucified.

It gives much additional force to this view of the subject, that not only those who are illiterate, but also the most learned and pious men of this day, whether Presbyterians, Episcopalians, or Baptists, read, admire, and love the Pilgrim's Progress. In further illustration of this trait, this coincidence and similarity in those who profess *true* religion, it may be remarked that Luther, Jonathan Edwards, Dr. Bellamy, Dr. Dwight, Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Scott, John Newton, George Burden, Whitefield, Fletcher, Bunyan, Dr. Gill, Fuller, and Dr. Baldwin, though belonging to six different demoninations, living at periods distant, and at distances great, and under external circumstances much diversified: do nevertheless agree essentially in their views of *true* religion.—Now, if these individuals and thousands of others, so variously distinguished, agree essentially in their views of *true* religion; and if these views be materially different from those maintained in the Christain Baptist; it will require evidence of an extraordinary nature to convince reflecting, judicious christians, that the Christian Baptist maintains correct views of *true* religion.—That this coincidence may not be supposed to relate to a single point in theology, let the following verses be considered as embracing so many or more distinct propositions. 1 Cor. ii. 14. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Rom. viii. 7." The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." John iii. 3. "Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Luke xiii. "But except ye repent, ye shall likewise perish." Acts viii. 37. "And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Now if the persons named above give essentially the same exposition or interpretation of these verses; such a coincidence proceeding from persons and circumstances so diverse, must go far to produce conviction that their interpretation is *true*. And if this interpretation be essentially different from that given by the Christian Baptist, this

discrepancy may justly excite an apprehension that its interpretation is *false*. But in the sequel of this examination it will appear that this discrepancy does exist. Perhaps no work of the same size has ever been received, by the christian community of different denominations, in these United States, with such universal approbation as Burder's Village Sermons. The multitude of new publications which have been issued from the press, has not, it is believed, diminished its growing popularity nor curtailed its usefulness. It so commends itself to every christian reader's conscience, as in the sight of God, that sectarian prejudice is at once disarmed and the heart led captive by the attraction of the Cross. But in the judgment of many, very many christians, there is as great a discrepancy between the view here given of *true* religion and that exhibited in the Christian Baptist, as there was between Abel's sacrifice and that of Cain—between Elijah's prayers and those of Baal's Prophet's—between Aaron's rod that blossomed and those of the magicians—between Peter's *faith* and that of Simon Magus. It will be conceded by all acquainted with the history of the visible church in our own country, that between Hophni and Phineas, Nadab and Abihu of the priesthood, and ungodly ministers, there have been, and still are, remarkable concidences, striking similarities—and their character and their doom ought to bear with solemn and mighty force upon all those who minister, or who expect to minister in holy things.

But King Saul, Absalom Jehu, Saul of Tarsus, Simon Magus, and Alexander the coppersmith, were characters too conspicuous, without the aid of a priestly robe, not to have furnished parallels for "remarkable coincidences, striking similarities, and concurrent contextures of events for the present day." Let the religious zealot behold on record the zeal of Jehu for the overthrow of idolatry, while the golden calves at Bethel remained unmolested. Let him then turn his eyes to the history of these times, and then to his own heart. Let the political and the religious aspirant contemplate Absalom stealing the hearts of the people—spreading the seeds of discord, rebellion, and treason amongst the peaceable and quiet subjects of his father—expelling him from his throne and from his own habitation, that he might judge and redress the grievances of the people: and then let him read the history of passing events, and inquire, Is there no coincidence, no similarity? Of Simon Magus it is written: Acts viii. 9, 10, 11, and 13; also, 18—23. "And there was a certain man called Simon, which before time, in the same city, used sorcery and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that *himself* was some *great* one. To whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is the great power of God. And to him they had regard, because that of long time he had bewitched them with sorceries. Then Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized," &c. Here is an express declaration that the subject of faith was *baptized*, and no one can doubt but he was baptized according to the mode instituted by Christ Jesus the Lord. Yet from the subsequent verses it is apparent that, as he offered to purchase the gift of the Holy Ghost with money, Peter pronounces him to be in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity. Whence it follows, that there may be faith followed by baptism, without the pardon of sin or gift of the Holy Ghost. But as the Lord of truth declares that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; it must be inferred that there are two kinds of faith—the one true—the other false—the one living—the other dead—the one connected with the pardon of sin and the salvation of the soul—the other leaving its hapless subject in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity, exposed to the fearful wrath to come. From Simon's character it is manifest also, that there may be external reformation without true repentance, without a change of heart. If, then, in his case, there was faith followed by baptism and yet no pardon of sin, no salvation; may there not be between his character and some *great* one's of the present day, "remarkable coincidence, striking similarities?"

The meaning of the phrase 'the supporters of the popular systems of this age,' considered in this position alone, would be very ambiguous. On the 12th page of the preface, however, it is acknowledged by the editor that he once belonged to the popular religion; but that he fortunately escaped after discovering his danger, without being buried in its ruins. It is understood that he was a Presbyteran; therefore the legitimate inference is, that the Presbyterian system is one of the popular systems of this age, and that by its supporters are meant chiefly its ministers. Dr. John Witherspoon, Jonathan Edwards, Dr. Joseph Bellamy, David Brainard, and Samuel Davis, are gone, as is confidently hoped and believed, to reap a long reward in the kingdom of their Father. While they were here they did not believe that immersion was essential, in the ordinance of baptism—or to the forgiveness of sin. Their spirit, however, characterized their works—their works demonstrated the reality and holiness of their faith, and marked their transit with beams of unfading glory. They have left successors, supporters of the same system, as humble, as holy, as devoted as themselves. That such men should be ranked with the false prophets and priests of Baal by the late *political* sage* of Monticello, can surprize no one acquainted with his religious sentiments. But that there should be such a "remarkable coincidence and striking similarity" between his sentiments and those of the Christian Baptist is worthy of universal notoriety and admiration. The limits prescribed to this number remind me that there is room only to repeat, "Ye shall know by them by their fruits, do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"

ABNER W. CLOPTON.

## REPLY TO MR. CLOPTON.

IF there continue such a lack of argument in Mr. Clopton's monthly papers as the present number exhibits, and as his preamble evinced, the publication of them and the reading of them in this work will be a dry sort of business. Nothing but a vehement desire to give my readers both sides, and to let them see with what weapons I am assaulted, could induce me to occupy so many pages with productions so vapid as the preceding. For easy reference I will follow his divisions headed "Remarks," in the numerical order.

*Remarks on Remarks, No.* 1. This first comment on an extract from the preface to the first volume of the *Christian Baptist*, contains no argument against any sentiment I have ever expressed. It is a charge against me for complaining that the religious newspapers were sectarian in their character, and devoted to sectarian interests. Is this charge just? Has he disproved it? Is not the "*Star*," the vehicle in which he rides, devoted to sectarian interests, and so one-sided as not to give both sides—and is it not a fair sample of the periodicals of the day? Let Mr. Clopton give us the name of a single periodical which he approves, that is not decidedly sectarian and one-sided. Till he does this my statement stands unimpeachable. That the *Christian Baptist* was one-sided he presumes not to affirm—that it is sectarian he would insinuate. But this is but an insinuation. See "Millennium, No. 2," in this present number, and the "Foundation of Christian Union," C. Baptist, volume 1, page 167, 2d edition, for a complete refutation of this impeachment. I might refer to almost every number for proof of the injustice of this imputation. If Mr. Clopton and Mr. Brantly, and Mr. Chambers of Georgetown, Kentucky, nickname the readers of the Christian Baptist, and call them

*See extracts from Mr. Jefferson's correspondence in the Visiter & Telegraph of December 5, 1829.

"*Campbellites*," is it not cruel for them to turn round and impute their own misdeeds to me for their being nicknamed? They have as much reason to blame the New Testament for all the sects which exist, or the Sun for darkness, as the "*Christian Baptist*" for any leaning to sectarianism. And as for the charge of *intolerance* against those who yield to all, perfect liberty of opinion, and proscribe no man except for disobedience or transgression of a positive command, it is as unfounded a calumny as ever was invented. Will Mr. Clopton sustain his charges by one proof? Whom did we ever proscribe or anathematize for a difference of opinion? He cannot bring a solitary specification. And I hope he will not say that I am intolerant because I censured some churches for retaining ungodly members, for not excluding drunkards and extortioners. These are the only characters towards whom I have evinced any sort of intolerance. All those who devour widows' houses, who oppress the poor, who do not live up to the matrimonial covenant, all immoral persons, all who refuse to obey the commandments of Jesus Christ, are those, and those only, towards whom I am intolerant.

*Remarks on Remarks, No.* 2. The extract from my preface, the text for these remarks, is as much perverted as ever did a disciple of Swedenborg pervert the narrative of the resurrection. Who that had not the religious jaundice could see "resentment, pointed, strong, and bitter as death," in this extract? But the phrase "*aspiring priesthood*" pierced the soul of this humble, unambitious, modest, and unassuming preacher. Does he not pretend to be "called of God as Aaron was?" Does he not *assume* to be specially called of God to preach the gospel? Does he not aspire to the honor of being sent of God to treat with sinners as an ambassador? Does he not aspire to the office of one who intercedes with God *officially* for sinners? Does he not aspire to the "holy hands" which break the elements of the Lord's supper? If he does, he claims a priestly office! Mr. Clopton, I do contend, substantially claims the honors and the office of a priest. And here is my proof: In consequence of his "divine call and ordination," he assumes to do that from which he would debar the members of his church. He would not tolerate a disciple in his church to baptize a candidate, nor "to administer the Lord's supper," nor to pray over the loaf or the cup. This is my proof: If he says he would, and does, permit the uncalled and unordained disciples thus to officiate, I will except him from the priesthood, the aspiring priesthood. If he does not, I must honor him with the name, for he deserves it. And I hereby inform Mr. Clopton and Messrs. A, B, and C, that I am always prepared to show that every man who assumes as much as Mr. Clopton, is an aspiring priest, in every substantial attribute of a Jewish or Papal priest. Put me to the proof now, Mr. Clopton, or rather, explain away, if you can, the proof I have brought against you.

*Remarks on Remarks, No.* 3. The quotation from the preface no more justifies these remarks, than does the Bible the doctrine of purgatorial fire. They are gratuitous. They are just as pertinent

to the text as Peter D'Alvos' volumes on the miraculous birth of the Messiah. As a specimen of the travestied style, I would say, that if the *Christian Baptist* had plead the special call of all preachers to proclaim the gospel, and administer "the sealing ordinances," their exclusive right to sit as Apostles and legislate for the church, their divine right to take texts, make sermons, and to claim a liberal support for themselves in so doing; had it commended their schemes to honor and adorn themselves with the titles of divinity, and the dignities of presidents and treasurers for all the "benevolent enterprizes" of the day; I say, had the editor of the Christian Baptist thus represented all the operations and assumptions of the priesthood as the suggestions of the Holy Spirit, then he would not have derided experimental religion—then he would have been truly regenerated, and as great a *saint* as Mr. Clopton and his brother Brantly. So much in Mr. Clopton's style—for his remarks on the third excerpt.

*Remarks on Remarks, No.* 4. These insinuations have been substantially made by Mr. Brantly, and examined in number 10, volume 7, Christian Baptist, page 217, to which I refer the reader. They are there shown to be manifestly unfair, uncandid, and without foundation. Persons who choose to pervert and insinuate, cannot be circumscribed by fact, nor by evidence. I did suppose that a person commencing a paper of the size and character of the Christian Baptist, opposing the schemes by which many were enriching themselves, necessarily calling forth the vengeance of the covetous, money-lovers, and ambitious, would be as free from the imputation of mercenary motives as man could be, where money is required, and especiully one who had the means and opportunity of increasing his estate by the application of some degree of skill and capital, to objects incomparably more promising pecuniary reward, than the editing of a one dollar volume per annum—and a person, too, who had all his life declined any remuneration as a teacher of religion. But it is only intended, I presume, to throw an obstacle in my way to expose the mercenary efforts of those hirelings who think that because they love money, and work for it, every other person is under the same influence.

If any teacher of religion can give more unequivocal proofs of disinterestedness, than did the editor of the Christian Baptist when he undertook that work, we shall thank Mr. Clopton to name him out, that we may form an acquaintance with him. I know one, if not two of my warmest opponents, whom I am confident he will not name.

There are sundry palpable mistakes (I will not call them by the hard name of falsehoods) in this calculation. He assumes as a fact that "the Christian Baptist has claimed the patronage of 4000 subscribers." This is a false fact. Where is the proof, Mr. Clopton? His talking about my foreseeing the events of seven years, such as my debate with Mr. Owen, deserves no notice. He also represents this work as containing each number about the same quantity of matter as one copy of the Star; whereas each number of this work

contains two super-royal sheets, and the Star is published upon one imperial sheet. Each number of the Star contains 16 pages, or 32 columns, nearly seven of the closest of which is contained in the preceding pages. He also represents the Star as being of the same price, contrary to its printed conditions, which make it $2,50 for a single subscriber in advance, or $3,00 if not paid in *advance*. It is, moreover, a single sheet like any common newspaper, differing only in the manner of its folding. His remarks upon the comparative size and price of the Harbinger and the Star remind me of some editor of a large newspaper in small type, claiming patronage because one of his papers contained as many words and letters as one of Sir Walter Scott's Waverly Novels, which sold for one dollar; whereas his paper was put at five cents. But this *politic* editor omitted to tell his readers that his paper was chiefly extracts from other pens and other papers, and advertisements for which he was paid by the reader and the writer too; and that his *sheet* was not *a book*, &c. Pretty similar is the representation of Mr. Clopton. I might, perhaps, as well, however, say, that I hope I shall have more than 4000 subscribers to the Harbinger—say *ten thousand*, and then it will yield, as a matter of course, in this climate where every thing is obtained for nothing, and every man pays his subscription, $20,000 per annum clear gain! This would be the best answer for such envious and jealous imputations. The reader needs only to remember that Mr. Clopton has been *employed* as solicitor for the Star, and that will account for his recommendation of the commodity on account of its *cheapness*.

I need not make use of such arguments to obtain subscribers. It is enough for me to put any of my works at the fair price of new and original works. Whenever I condescend to become a gleaner, and publish matter which has been published a hundred times before, then I will make *the cheapness* of a publication its passport into the hands of those who have more money than sense, and value the article by showing how valueless it is! This is, perhaps, the best answer to give to such imputations and vulgar assertions.

Please see the doctrine of the days of witchcraft, revived in Philadelphia, and Charlotte county, Va. They were wont to try a suspected witch by plunging her in a pond; if she was drowned, she was proved not to have been a witch; but if she could swim, then she was a witch and must be taken to execution. The imputation itself was death. If the *Christian Baptist* had been killed by the priests, then it would have been as clear as day that it was heretical, and now that it could not be killed, but has given birth to this work, then both are from this single circumstance proved to be heretical.

*Remarks on Remarks, No.* 5. The sermon is again unwarranted by the text. I presume Mr. Clopton is so much accustomed to depart from the text, that it would be marvellous to see him only once following in its train. His encomiums upon some authors, which he appears never to have read with much attention, is so impertinent to the object proposed, as to merit no notice from me. I would therefore dis-

miss it with a remark or two. John Buyan stands high deservedly. His Pilgrim's Progress is one of the best religious novels I have ever read. I am not, however, much skilled in this sort of composition, never having read a dozen in all my life. The Pilgrim's Progress stands at the head of my list as the best of the best which I have read. *Bunyan exactly describes the pilgrims which the clergy of the last two centuries have made.* This is the merit of the Pilgrim's Progress. But Mr. Clopton's drawing together Edwards and Baldwin, Fuller and Gill, and Gill and Fletcher, as agreeing *essentially* in their doctrinal views, is proof positive that he has either never read, or has entirely forgotten the contents of them. Gill and Fletcher are as complete antipodes as systems can make.

But, in the remarks made upon the last extract, there are but two ideas carried out. The one is, *ad captandum vulgus*, to catch the unwary, by representing all the names deduced, while coming from *six sects*, as agreeing essentially; (like Gill and Fletcher, palpably contradicting one another on the *five points;*) as giving one explanation, and all uniting against me. I do not pin my faith to any of these men, nor to all of them. Nor does the concurrence of these men "in explaining one text" prove their interpretation just, any more than the concurrence of ten orders of monks uniting in sustaining the pretensions of the Pope, proves the infallibillity of "his Holiness." I have often said there are but three or four men preaching in all Protestant christendom. What are the three thousand Methodistic preachers but three thousand trumpets echoing John Wesley's voice? What are the two thousand Calvinistic Presbyterians but two thousand trumpets reverberating the accents of John Calvin? What are the hundreds of Lutheran preachers on this continent but trumpets resounding the dogmas of Martin Luther. Mr. Clopton's *packed jury* shall never sit in any question in which I am concerned. I will change the venue to Jerusalem, and be tried by the apostolic jury alone.

His next effort in the last extract is to compare me to Saul, Absalom, Jehu, Saul of Tarsus, Simon Magus, and Alexander the coppersmith. I must thank him for this honor. I am not permitted to reply to this. It must pass for what it is worth. Paul commands me to "bear evil treatment," and to "render to no man railing for railing."

A word on Simon's baptism—The apostles were deceived in this case. What then? Did they adopt a new course? Did they refuse to baptize the next applicant on the same profession? No. This merits much consideration. Mr. Clopton's corollary from this case is as cheap as the Columbian Star. He says, "It is manifest that there may be external reformation without true repentance,"—and yet it was manifest to the apostles, through *the want of external reformation*, that his heart was in the gall of bitterness!! From the case of Judas it is manifest there may be true repentance without reformation.—Now what are the two corollaries worth? As much as the following sentence will pass for among logicians—"Dr. Witherspoon, J. Edwards, J. Bellamy, D. Brainard, and S. Davis are gone to heaven."

believes Mr. Clopton. I hope he may meet them there. But will this sanctify his and their errors!

If Mr. Clopton has nothing more argumentive to offer for his system, and against the Christian Baptist, I will promise my readers not to trouble them soon with so long a portion of his rhapsodies.—Nor will I be induced easily again to defend my character from such imputations as those which appear in the present number. I thank the Lord that, although opposing corruption and immorality in the professors of religion for many years, no man has ever been able to fasten on me a single imputattion. My worst enemies have conceded to me a good character, and such as it is, it is too generally known to require any defence at home; and if a man is fearless *at home*, he is invulnerable abroad. I will, however, divest the controversy with the sects of allusions to particular individuals as much as possible. I determined that my opponents shall not draw me off from an exposure of the corruptions of systems and measures into the imputations and defences of men. I have some important developments of principles to submit and some alarming displays of the tendencies of systems and measures to offer, from which I shall take care not to be diverted by the wiles of the enemy. If Mr. Clopton should proceed as he has begun, in commenting on the Christian Baptist, it will require about one century to get through with the seven volumes; and rather than examine ten bushels of chaff for one grain of wheat, we will bestow it with the chaff to the north-west wind. Should he, however, change his course, and Mr. Brantly publish my replies—so long as he has a new argument to offer, he will find me forthcoming.

EDITOR.

## A CHRISTIAN SPIRIT.

I KNOW of no spirit less understood, and less exhibited, than a *christian spirit.* It is a sweet phrase, a common phrase, a much abused phrase. But let me ask, What is a *christian spirit?* It is a spirit like that of Jesus Christ. It is the spirit which the doctrine of Christ inculcates, infuses, and perfects. It is distinguished by many epithets, such as a meek spirit, a mild spirit, a holy spirit, a forgiving spirit, a loving spirit. But it is better understood from a close examination of the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ, than from any abstractions or contrasts which can be set forth upon paper. To learn the christian spirit, we must, like Mary, sit at his feet; or, like John, recline upon his breast. We must keep close and constant company with Jesus, and with his most intimate companions, the Apostles, who caught most of his spirit and temper.

His was a condescending spirit. There was no respect of men's persons with Jesus Christ. He did not flatter the rich nor the popular, nor did he revile them as such. He did not despise the poor, nor contemn them of low degree. He was, compared with the spirit of those in high stations, remarkable for his condescending spirit. The plea of the destitute he did not disregard. He was most familiar with the humble poor. He did not respect the poor as such, any

more than the rich as such; for some of the poor are still as vile as the rich: nay, some of them are more vile than they. But goodness, whether cloathed in rags, or decorated with scarlet, which, however, is an attire seldom worn by goodness, was that which caught his attention and captivated his heart. He admired the diamond whether surrounded with filth or giving lustre to a crown. And as goodness has hitherto been a more intimate guest with the poor and the despised, than with the rich and honorable, for that reason he was more familiar with the poor than with the rich.

Nearly allied to a condescending spirit is a sympathizing spirit.—This was most conspicuous in the Christian Chief. None ever equalled him in this. Between the highest attainments in the possession and demonstration of a sympathizing spirit and the sympathy of Jesus, there is a wider distance than between any other attribute of his spirit and the aspirations of his most distinguished followers.—No son of sorrow, no child of anguish ever sought his aid in vain. Alive was he to all the pains and all the maladies of the unfortunate. He felt the sorrows which he saw, and wept with those that wept. His was a sympathy that felt not only such agonies as make the most unfeeling relent, but the slightest inconvenience of those around him, awakened his pity and called forth his regard: "I cannot send them away hungry, lest they faint by the way," shows to what slight afflictions his tenderness responded. It was, perhaps, something owing to this that he made himself so familiar with the poor—not because there is in poverty by itself so much to pity, as because of the insolence which the rich have shown to the poor.

But his was a candid spirit. Some do not know what candor means who talk much about it. Many, too, admire it who never exhibit it. This is a very high encomium upon it. All, candid and uncandid, admire candor. An open, generous, honest, and ingenuous air, claims and forces a tribute of respect from all. To acknowledge and admit all the good properties, all the good traits of character in an enemy, an antagonist, or an opponent, has a charm, a nobility about it which the most insensible cannot but feel. Those whom Jesus most denounced for intolerance, if they had a good property at all he gave them credit for it. If they only told the truth, and did not practise it, he acknowledged it. If there was a single redeeming quality in the greatest compound of inconsistencies or of wickedness, it was respected and acknowledged. But now a single apprehended defect, in the estimation of some called christians, covers a multitude of virtues. If a mere difference of opinion, in any item deemed important, be found in a man, no matter how excellent in behavior, he is ranked among heathen men and publicans.

One of the evils, the great evils attendant on one of the handmaids of sectarianism, one of its greatest, largest, and foulest blots, is, that it destroys all reverence and respect for good men. "Without any love to good men" is one of the most prominent characters of an apostate church. One of the signs of the perilous age of which Paul spoke was this: "They are without any liking for good men." Is he

orthodox—is he sound—is he one of us? constitute the great virtue which all sectaries admire and love. If he be not one of us, this one exception excepts him out of the pale of our regards, and places him among those whom, for God's sake, we ought to dislike. If "*Saint Paul*," as some call him, were in disguise among us now, I am fully convinced he would be most hated by many esteemed the most devout. "Charity hides a multitude of sins;" but Sectarianism, like the cloud that separated Israel and Pharaoh, casts darkness over those who differ in opinion from us, and sheds a halo of glory on those who agree with us.

Time was when a man's behavior, his piety, and humanity, obtained for him the esteem and affection of all good men; but now his being one of us in opinion and in sectarian feeling, is all that charms us—it is all that we love; and his being enrolled on some other catalogue of saints than upon our catalogue, hides from our view every excellency he may possess. If Jesus Christ were now on earth in disguise, not a sect in christendom could acknowledge him, for he would not acknowledge them; and while they would be speaking the praise and extolling the excellencies of *a* Jesus Christ of their own, they would be thrusting the Faithful and True Witness out of their synagogue, and seeking for the brow of some hill from which to precipitate him to ruin.

These remarks have been called forth not so much from a design to write an essay upon a christian spirit, as to place in a fair light the conduct of some who are accusing us of the want of a christian spirit. What they call, or seem to call, a christian spirit, is that spirit which approves their course, and commends them in all their undertakings; that spirit which says to them, "Well done!" whether or not they have *done well.*

But before I give any application to these remarks, I must notice another trait of a christian spirit. It is a spirit that rejoices not in iniquity—that rejoices in the truth. Jesus loved the truth supremely. The God of truth delights in truth. And that which calls for the supreme affection and regard of all the good, and of all who fear and love God, is *the truth.* The Devil is the "father of lies," and by lies he has wrought all his sorceries upon the children of men. Our common mother was deceived by a lie, and by lies he reigns, and has always reigned, in the hearts of the children of disobedience. The good hate lies; and a lie, which is another name for sin, is all they do, for it is all they can, legitimately hate. Christians love all truth; but their love for truth burns into jealousy for that which is emphatically called *the truth.* Had it not been for this, Paul the Apostle had never dared to have said, "If any man or angel proclaim any other gospel than the true, let him be an anathema." His opposition to men proceeded from their opposition to the truth. He knew, without supernatural inspiration, that some of those who withstood him were enemies to the truth. As such he and his associates unceremoniously treated them. They had no personal ill will; nay, they prayed for them whom they denounced as enemies of the *true* gospel.

It is quite compatible with the meekness, mildness, and tenderness of a christian spirit, to reprove, rebuke, and expose hypocrites and false pretenders to truth and righteousness. Had it not been compatible with such a spirit, why should the advocates for the true religion have been commanded by the Apostles to reprove sharply and rebuke with all boldness false teachers and pretenders. Paul to Timothy thus speaks: "Confute, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering when teaching: for there will be a time when they will not endure wholesome teaching; but, having itching ears, they will, according to their own lusts, heap up to themselves teachers; and from the truth, indeed, they will turn away their ears, and be turned unto fables." Some have accused Paul of the want of a christian spririt because of such sayings as the following:—"Alexander the coppersmith has done me many evil things: the Lord will reward him according to his works. Of whom beware, for he has greatly withstood our words." "There are many unruly talkers and deceivers, especially those of the (orthodox, I was going to say) circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; who subvert whole families, teaching things which they ought not for the sake of gain." "One of themselves, a prophet of their own, has said, The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy bellies." "This testimony is true; for which cause rebuke them sharply that they may be healthy in the faith." While Paul exhorted Timothy to bear evil treatment, and in meekness to instruct those who oppose themselves, he commanded this course also with regard to some.

I have pursued the same course as nearly as I can judge. I have as little to condemn in myself, from all that I know of my own heart, because of the want of a christian spirit, as I have on any other account whatever. My opponents have compelled me into this egotism; yet I presume they will not forgive it. But justice to my Sovereign and to the cause I plead, compels me to say something about my own feelings. I have searched my heart—I have examined my motives, as with a lighted candle, on this very subject—not once, nor twice, but many times. I do not say that I have infallibly felt and undeviatingly exhibited a christian spirit; but I will say, my failures have been most sensible to myself on other occasions, than when writing against those who have been my warmest opponents. Some of my opponents I do know are *bad men*—I mean wicked men. They have plainly exhibited to all men that they were wicked men. I will not now name, but I could name some of my warmest opponents who have rendered themselves so obnoxious for their *immoralities*, as to have the meeting-house doors of even my warm religious opponents shut against them—as to be literally shut out of decent private families who had no affection for me. And I am much mistaken if some others, who are now opposing me, will not soon stand forth in the same black characters of those to whom I allude. I do know that others of my opponents are good men, but mistaken in me and in my controversy with the sects. I have good evidence of both characters. Others are with me doubtful. I know not to which class they belong. Now I cannot say unto the wicked, Thou art righteous, nor can I treat

the righteous as the wicked.' I do not, either, set myself up as a judge of the character of my opponents. By their overt acts I know them. I do not "gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles. I will bear evil treatment, and I will in meekness instruct some opponents, and with sharpness rebuke others, EDITOR.

## BEAVER ANATHEMA, MR. WINTER, AND THE STAR.

I MUST again allude to the *Beaver Anathema.** Once again, and once for all, I will affirm, that, upon me personally this anathema was not at all regarded as afflicting any wound or dishonor. Nay; I rather glory in reproaches, than shrink from them. But seeing that it was designed to prejudice the minds of the uninformed, and seeing the great exertions that were making to publish it all over the Union, I thought myself in duty called to expose it, as exhibiting a most unjust caricature of the sentiments and practices of my brethren laboring with me—and knowing something of the *characters* of those from whom it emanated, I thought myself called upon to take the notice of it which I have taken in two numbers of the Christian Baptist.

Since the last number of the Christian Baptist was in type, the Columbian Star brought me, as it often does, some of the lowest scurrility and abuse for what I said concerning Mr. Winter, in the form of a certificate from the First Baptist Church in Pittsburgh, signed Wm. H. Hart, Clerk. This certificate purports to be from the whole church, and avers that, "*Every particular published by Mr. Campbell in volume 7, page 184, of the Christian Baptist, respecting Mr. Winter, is unqualifiedly false, and without even the shadow of truth to sustain him in his slanders.*" What a malicious slanderer I must be! Not even a *shadow of truth* to sustain me!! What an inventer of evil things I must be? This comes, too, from a *whole church*, recollect, and was signed by—I was going to say the greatest *saint* in Pittsburgh—*Wm. H. Hart.* Concerning this gentleman I will only remind my old readers that he was the confidant, aider, and abettor of Lawrence Greatrake, of *calumniating* memory. I will not descend farther to particulars. But it is the act of *a whole church*; signed by its clerk, concerning events that happened in the year 1822, before the present *First Baptist Church was born.* We knew, and we admit, that *twelve members* once *legitimately excommunicated* from the Regular First Baptist Church in Pittsburg, is the *nucleus*, of this present First Baptist Church. These twelve may have known something about Mr. Winter's arrival in Pittsburg; but how the present First Baptist Church in Pittsburgh, consisting of say some, sixty or perhaps more persons, can despose upon such an event, would furnish some intricacies for lawyers and courts; and, however it may pass in an ecclesiastical court, it would not bear much investigation before Cesar's judgment seat. It is presumed that they were *unanimous* as was the Beaver Association in their anathema. Such *ananimity* is very *creditable*, though its *credibility* is not so indisputable

* See Christian Baptist, vol 7. page 183.

But now for the admissions of my statement concerning Mr. Winter, found in this certificate. Notwithstanding all the generality and universality of its protestations against my statement, it admits every prominent item as respects the arrival of Mr. Winter, and Mr. Rigdon's treatment of him, and Mr. Winter's treatment of the church. There are, at least, seventeen distinct propositions concerning Mr. Winter, in the page alluded to, (page 184, C. B.) Of these, six, or at most seven, are excepted against in the certificate. It is admitted that Mr. Winter came to Pittsburg in the year 1822; it is admitted that brother Rigdon took him and family into his house and sustained them for a time; it is admitted that brother Rigdon introduced him to the church, and invited him to preach; that he afterwards opposed brother Rigdon; that Mr. Winter left the city and removed into the bounds of the Beaver Association; that he divided some churches, &c. &c. All these statements are admitted in the certificate, and some of them proved, by as good testimony as can be found, in the last number of the Christian Baptist. Yet, in direct contradiction of their own admissions, they say that "every one of my statements is false, and that there is not a shadow of truth to sustain them." Now, I ask, is such testimony credible! If persons glaringly contradict themselves, who can repose confidence in them!

It is a pleasure to me to reflect that the mistakes concerning the time of the year of Mr. Winter's arrival, and the size of his family, and his landing in Baltimore instead of Philadelphia, were corrected by me in the Christian Baptist, before I saw this certificate in the Star. They were written on the 18th of April, and the Star was issued the 17th in Philadelphia. I had, by associating another family in distress of which I had heard, fallen into a mistake of the size of Mr. Winter's family and the month in which he had arrivid in Pittsburg. I have, however, sent in quest of documents concerning the matter, which it may be necessary yet to lay before the public. This correction, I say, was made in the Christian Baptist before the certificate appeared. And when it is substracted from the merits of the whole matter, it leaves the statement I made, as affecting the conduct of Mr. Winter, just where it was. Besides, it has been corroborated since by *two* witnesses in the Christian Baptist, No. 12, vol 7. pages 271 and 272.

Thus in vindicating the Mahoning Association, I was obliged to go into a detail which Mr. Williams or Mr. Hart calls "nefarious." I was obliged to mention the name of Mr. Winter, perhaps *providentially*; for had I not mentioned his name, in all probability a most outrageous transgressor never would have been detected. Had I not mentioned his name, the following letter, in all probability, never would have appeared in print. Had I not fallen into a mistake about the size of his family, and the time of his arrival in Pittsburg, and the port at which he landed, such documents to detect an impostor never would have been furnished. But I think he that ruleth over men, and to whose all-seeing eye all things are naked and manifest, has designed to give another lesson to this generation, that men may

be very orthodox, and make much noise about error in doctrine, and denounce reformation, and yet be like whited sepulchres, full of rottenness and corruption.

If the following letter suit not the individual mentioned, it will be easy to show it does not; and if it do not, it will be necessary that the public be in possession of it to guard them against imposition. The following is an attested copy of a letter from a Christian in Liverpool to the Rev. Dr. *Glendy*, of Baltimore, touching an impostor in this country. The publication of the Beaver Anathema brought it to me from an authentic source. It speaks for itself:—

LIVERPOOL, 15*th June*, 1822.

"*Rev. Mr. Glendy*—Baltimore—

"SIR—At the recommendation of our mutual friend, Mr. Cather of this place, I make free to inform you of a circumstance which has inflicted a deep wound on the cause of religion in the North of England, by one whose professions, education, and general character, had recommended him to a pretty general acquaintance as one of its advocates.

"A Mr. *Winter*, formerly a student in the respectable Baptist Academy, Yorkshire, and (probably 10 months since) ordained Pastor over a newly formed Baptist Church at North or South Shields, near New Castle, had made himself acceptable as a preacher; a new place of worship had been erected; subscriptions to a considerable amount obtained for payment of the expenses; and Mr. W. had gone on a tour for 5 weeks in order to obtain enough to discharge the remr. of the sum, when his friends learnt, to their unspeakable surprize and grief, that he had eloped with a young married woman, a member of his church; and that they were on the point of embarking for the United States. I have since learnt that they shipped themselves for Baltimore, (taking an infant with them, suspected to be the fruit of a former illicit connexion between them) and I rather think (though I cannot immediately ascertain the fact) on the 12th April, in the Newburyport, Captain Goodrich, from this port.

"The object of these lines will now explain itself. Mr Winter (who embarked, I understand, with this woman, in the names of Mr. and Mrs. Winter of Kidderminster) is personally unknown to me: but his conduct has done already abundant injury to the cause he has betrayed, and I am anxious that the same cause should not be further wounded, when I have the opportunity of honorably warding off the blow. You are perhaps already aware that your country has often been reproached here with receiving as ministers of the gospel the outcasts of our society. I should, indeed, be grieved could I think there were any *just* ground for the charge. That such men have been improperly received at times, I have good reason to think; but it is not always easy to detect hypocrisy, or we ourselves should not have been, as in this instance, the dupes of designing villainy. It behoves us mutually to avoid the extremes of unnecessary suspicion and hasty familiarity; but in a people "given to hospitality," as yours is, the

latter is, perhaps, likely to be the more prevailing fault, and an immoral ministry is, perhaps, as great a curse as can be inflicted upon us, and therefore ought to be regarded with a very jealous eye.

"I need make no apology, sir, for this freedom—a good design needs none. I know no one in Baltimore but Dr. Mason, formerly of New York, and Romeyn of that place, as well as several other clergymen there; and in particular among my lay friends there, Mr. Divie Bethune, or Mr. Benjamin Marshall, can inform you what is due to my representation.

"I leave it to your discretion what use to make of it—and am, very respectfully, sir, your obedient servant.

"SAM. HOPE."

I heard of a preacher—nay, I know one in this country who was the most denouncing against Arminians: he was an orthodox Regular, of flaming zeal. He was convicted before a part of the public of a crime not to be named; and yet his church sustained him because of his orthodoxy, and I believe he yet "preaches" to the church; but the world will not hear him. It is the misfortune of all societies to have sometimes wolves amongst them—lions and tigers too, (I think Paul calls Alexander the coppersmith a lion) in sheep's clothing. But to sustain any man, acting immorally, because of the doctrine "*once in grace, always in grace*," or because of his orthodoxy, is as bad as to suffer that woman Jezabel to seduce to the basest crimes those who profess godliness. The reader is reminded that the certificate above alluded to came from the "lovers of truth and righteousness." We shall look for the proof. As yet it is *word* only. They will find when they make another experiment, that Solomon's proverb is yet true—"*The wicked flee when no man pursues them, but the righteous are bold as a lion.*"

EDITOR.

## A WORD TO MR. BRANTLY.

TACITUS says, that, "as to a common sewer, so to Rome, flowed the filth of all nations;" so to the columns of the Star flows (I shall give it no name) ——— of all the enemies of reform. His "*corroboration*" from an *anonymous* traducer in the Star of the 17th, dated at Cincinnati, is presumed to be a compouud of malicious falsehoods. Let him give up the name of his correspondent, and we will, if he have any standing or character, notice his calumnies. Till then he may act like the assassin. We will consider him a cowardly and self-condemned accuser of the brethren, who "loves darkness rather than light."

As he published with peculiar zest the Pittsburg certificate, will he insert the preceding reply, and such certificates as we may send him pertaining to that subject?

EDITOR.

## LETTER TO R. B. SEMPLE.—*No. II.*

*Dear Sir,*

IF all my opponents were as candid as you—if they exhibited a christian spirit like you—if they were as disinterested and as easy to be entreated as you—my controversy with them, call it by its most unacceptable name—I say, my *controversy* with them would be much more pleasing, profitable, and easy to be terminated. But what a generation of perverters, misinterpreters, and captious spirits have beset me! who, like the great adversary, are lying continually in wait to devour.

But, sir, while I have the Philistines before my face, their allies on my right hand and on my left, it is some consolation to see the face of a good old Israelite, who loves the King and the cause I serve, and differs from me only in what are the best ways and means of serving him.

Brother Semple, you and I were not taught first by Paul, and therefore we will have to wrestle with ourselves for some time before we can rise from among the pots, and think and feel like them who were taught by the Apostles. Some vessels long retain the flavor of the first liquor which filled them. Our minds resemble them a little. Neither you nor I, methinks, will ever understand and feel the whole result of the christian institution upon our minds as though we had never been indoctrinated into the systems of Calvin, Gill, and Fuller. I have been at war with myself, more than with any man living, for many years, to eradicate from my mind every plant which Paul did not plant, nor Peter water. In this I consider myself as having only partially succeeded. Care is to be taken here, as well as elsewhere, that, in rooting out the tares, the wheat is not also rooted out.

But it is only by the constant study of the oracles that we can attain to those clear and healthful views of the religion which produced such wonderful effects upon the first converts. Those who depend upon any operation of the Holy Spirit to impart to them what is already written, or to explain it to them, will never, never find such aid. I think the experience of *one thousand years* last past is enough to support this last saying if there was not another word to be said upon it. Do you ask what experience? I answer, the individual experience of all the devout of every name, and every page of the history of all the great and good men of that period.

Where is the man now living, and where is the history of the man now dead, to whom God has specially revealed any thing in the Oracles but by studying them. The students of systems have become learned in systems; and the students of the Bible, *and none else*, have become learned in the sacred writings. How many myriads of praying non-readers have prayed for light without finding it! How long did John Bunyan, Newton, *cum multis aliis*, pray for light without finding it, before they betook themselves to the Oracles. How many now *pray for the Spirit to guide them into all truth?* And, since the Apostles died, to whom has this prayer been answered? Was Newton,

Bunyan, Gill, Fuller, Wesley, Calvin, or Luther, or are the myriads of preachers now praying for the same favor, led into *all* truth! As naturally might we pray for *manna* now to fall from heaven upon us, to save us from cultivating the earth, as to expect such teachings and guidings as ninety-nine hundredths of the religious of all denominations are praying for, but never finding. The Spirit, you will agree with me, teaches Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, &c. &c. alike. Why, then, do they all continue as they were? God's Spirit imparts light only to them who read or hear the Oracles, and as he blesses the labors of the diligent husbandman with the early and the latter rain, so he is blessed who devotes his energies to the written word.

You say that the result of your inquiries was "a firm belief that without the influence of God's Spirit directly on your heart, you could not be saved." You add, "Well, sir, I sought it, as a sinner, a justly condemned sinner, and I have found it, thanks to sovereign grace!" That such is your conviction, and that you found the favor of God, I doubt not. But would not any other person, who sought with equal sincerity, have found all that you found? And if so, why do you ascribe it to a special grace in your particular case? The Lord promises the Holy Spirit to every one who asks, desiring it, just as certain as natural parents give good things to their crying children. Do only some of the asking children receive what they solicit from their parents? Again, let me ask, What did you find that was not before written? Any new promise, any special promise, any new light, which was not before as distinctly and as clearly proposed as God could propose it in human language? Had you not faith before you asked, and was not this faith a persuasion that God exists, and is the rewarder of all who diligently seek him? You could not have asked for any thing which you did not before believe God had promised to bestow. Could a child who never heard or believed that there was a diamond, ask for one? Your faith in God's favor was established before you bowed your knee! The difficulty with you was a special interest in it. This I know, for my experience was like yours in this particular. I desired to feel a special interest, and for this I prayed. But mark this, brother Semple, if you and I had been taught that God's philanthropy equally embraced all, and that all to whom the word of this salvation was sent, were equally warranted to appropriate it to themselves, this concern for a special interest never could have originated. It was a previous system assented to, which gave birth to these desires and prayers; otherwise as soon as you believed God's promise through Jesus Christ, you would have found yourself embraced. No one in the primitive age ever made such a prayer as you and I were taught to make; no one languished then for a day or a week to be born again. All were commanded to reform, and instantly all who obeyed received forgiveness of sins. Our converts are sometimes agonizing before they are born again for months—for years. This destroys the figure, and it proves that a false philosophy has perverted us from the simplicity of the gospel.

The Spirit, you say, opens our understanding. I doubt not but all the light which shines into our understanding on the unseen and future world, is communicated by God's Spirit. But that light shines only in the written word. *To open the understanding* is explained as synonymous to *open the scriptures.* One represents it thus: "Then he opened their understandings to understand the Scriptures." Another historian, relating the same incident, says, "He opened unto them the scriptures"—a very common mode of speaking, and one of easy intelligence. One man thus opens the understanding of another when he opens the subject to his apprehension of it.

The popular doctrine of the Calvinian school, in all its ramifications, is this, that notwithstanding all that has been done by the death of Jesus, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the preachings of the Apostles, still an omnipotent act is necessary to produce faith in God, to unveil the grace contained in the word; nay, more, that it is dangerous not to assent to this position, and not to teach it to all who inquire for the knowledge of salvation. Now this abstraction, or speculative point, is at the very root of all the moral ruins of Calvinian christendom. When I see a grain of corn, I am willing to say it is the act of omnipotence; but if any man ask me, Does God put forth an act of omnipotence in producing every grain of corn? I answer, No: he gave birth to a system that creates it, under which system human agency can produce it in millions of measures. So I reason in this case. The means are adapted to the end in both cases. But this is only "my theory," and that is yours. When we proceed to convert men we command them to obey the gospel after we have proposed it to them. At least this was the old-fashioned way.

There is one expression, more than any other, I regret to see in your letter; and that I need not inform you, is, your calling the gospel a *dead letter*—that which Paul calls *the power and wisdom of God* to every one who believes it. It is not to those who disbelieve it a *dead letter*, for it kills them—as some say, "It is a savor of death to them." Now if the gospel be a *dead letter*, how can it condemn the disobedient. *A dead man can neither kill nor save!* A dead letter can neither save nor condemn. Jesus said his *word* was *spirit* and LIFE. No scripture says, brother Semple, what you have said; that "it is the Spirit of God which makes it sharp and two-edged." Paul, to whom *I* look up, says "the word of God is LIVING, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing," &c. He qualifies it not as you have done. If, again, as you say, the Spirit has revealed Jesus for six thousand years, without any written revelation, of what use is the revelation to us, and why so much concern in sending *the word* to the heathen! This looks a little like making the word of God of non-effect. But I will not press this matter until you have an opportunity to explain yourself. To conclude, I would say, brother, I can only show my faith by my works; and it is only when these works accord with what the Spirit has already said to the churches, that I or you can approve its character. I will ever rejoice to see your faith, and love, and liberality always growing

abundantly. Hoping soon to hear from you, I remain affectionately yours in the hope of immortality.

EDITOR.

## HISTORY OF SIN, INCLUDING THE OUTLINES OF ANCIENT HISTORY.—*No. II.*

THE object of these essays is to develope the progress of sin in the human family, by presenting its influences upon individuals and nations; next, to prepare the reader more fully to understand the prophecies from a brief outline of ancient history and geography. These selections we will cull from the most authentic sources, and present with all possible brevity. The history of Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Greece, and Rome, is so blended with sacred history, and so woven into the prophecies of both Testaments, that a general idea of these states and empires is indispensable to an apprehension of the compass of the prophetic writings. In this number we represent the outlines of Egyptian history. We are happy in finding it well sketched, almost to our hand, in Lectures upon Ancient Hisorty by S. Whelply, A. M. Member of the Literary and Philosophical Society of New York. In my last article under this topic, I simply noticed the awful monuments of the divine indignation against sin in the destruction of the Old World by water. *Ed. M. H.*

"WHEN we come on this side the watery waste, a guide of a different character offers her services: I mean the historic muse. Nearest to her lofty tower lie the fields of modern Europe. They are wide, elevated, and diversified with every kind of prospect.

The genius of war, ever ready to

*"Whelm nations in blood, and wrap cities in fire,"*

reigns in modern Europe. A little further off, and retired under a heavier shade, lie the ages of Gothic darkness. Through these she conducts you to the elevated destinies, and imperial grandeur of ancient Rome. Like the Alps among ordinary hills and vallies, she towers above all nations, and for ages gave law to the world. You see her an empire, a republic, a kingdom, a clan. Still further back, you behold a wonderful people, of less sullen majesty, but of more brilliancy of intellect and vigor of genius; there the temple of science displayed its fair columns, and expanded its majestic portals.

Still far distant beyond the Greeks, you behold the Persians, the Assyrians, the Egyptians, each flourishing in their day, and filling remoter grounds of the receding prospect.

Between these nations and the Deluge, there is still a wide expanse, through which the Mosaic history has drawn a single line, like a thread of silver, without breadth. But here the historic muse gives you her perspective, and bids you make the best of what you can see. You see heroes and giants, and gods and demons, blended

in a scene which declares itself to be fabulous; and you perceive yourself to be in the heroic ages. The traditionary tales, the fables, the mythological fictions of the Romans, Greeks, and Egyptians, lie here. Here are the exploits of Theseus, the labors of Hercules, the lives and actions of those men whom credulous and superstitious nations deified and adored.

The country of Egypt occupies the north-eastern corner of the continent of Africa; is between five and six hundred miles long, and from fifty to one hundred and fifty miles broad. The territory is long and narrow, though of a very equal breadth; and the river Nile, passing from South to North, runs through the plains of Egypt, and falls into the Mediterranean sea by several mouths. It is usually bounded on the North by the Mediterranean sea, on the East by the Isthmus of Suez and the Red sea, on the South by Ethiopia, and on the West by Lybia. It extends from the latitude 31 North, nearly to the tropic of Cancer. The southern parts of Egypt have an almost vertical Sun, in the summer months.

Rain seldom falls in Egypt. The sky is generally serene in every part of the year, and the power of the Sun, from May to September, is oppressive; yet the climate, especially as it anciently was, is, perhaps, excelled by few parts of the earth. The defect of rain is compensated by copious dews; and the lands bordering on the Nile are enriched by its inundations to a surprising degree. Dr. Clarke, a late scientific and judicious traveller, who was in Egypt during the invasion of Bonaparte, observes, that bad as the civil and moral state of Egypt now is, it far surpassed all his former conceptions of luxuriancy of vegetation, and fertility of soil.

The ancient power and grandeur of Egypt was owing greatly to its extent of commerce. An attentive consideration of the map of the globe will show that Cairo, Alexandria, and Memphis, were perhaps, situated for a grander scale of commerce than any other great cities, not excepting Constantinople or London. From Alexandria, a sail of ten days brought them, with ease, into the Grecian islands of the Achipelago. Ten days more carried them through the Hellespont and Strait of Bosphorus into the Black Sea, whose great rivers, Boristhenes, Tanais, and others, collected the inland trade of Central Asia and northern Europe. West of this grand emporium lay all the northern shores of the Mediterranean, comprising the South of Spain, and France, and Italy, and the Island; and the southern shores of the same sea, the northern coast of Africa. Besides, but a little distance from Alexandria, East, over land, lay the ports of the Red Sea, some of which had become famous in the days of Solomon and David. From Ezion Geber, or Berenice, as it was afterwards called, the Tyrans, Jews and other nations, anciently, and the merchants of Palmyra, in latter times, carried on an immensely rich trade.—From the ports of the Red Sea through the Straits of Babel Mandal, a few weeks, and a safe voyage, brought them to India and all its rich islands.

These advantages were perceived by the pervading mind of Alexander the Great, who built Alexandria. Nor was he deceived; for in twenty years after he founded this city, which was to bear his name, it became the greatest emporium of trade upon earth. Whatever is known of the fertility of Egypt in our own times, it was once far more fertile and pleasant than it is now. It appears, from various observations, that the sands of the African deserts are gradually spreading further North, and intrenching more and more on the states of Barbary. Probably the indolence and vice of these nations invite the empire of sand, and hasten its dominion, by neglecting their soil, and laying it open to the desert.

What settlers arrived in Egypt after the Deluge, it is impossible to say. I shall, however, follow the general opinions of ancient writers on this subject, and consider the kingdom of Egypt as founded by Menes, or Mieraim, the grandson of Noah, one hundred and sixty years after the Deluge. And from this datum shall submit to your consideration the following

*Analysis of the History of Egypt.*

I. From the foundation of the monarchy by Menes, 160 years after the Flood, to the end of the reign of Psammentus; who was conquered by Cambyses, king of Persia. This period contains 1663 years. During this time, Egypt was governed by dynasties of its native princes; in the scriptures generally called *Pharaohs*.

II. From the death of Psammenitus, A. C. 525, to the death of Alexander the Great, A. C. 321. This period contains 204 years; during which time the Egyptian history is involved with that of the Persians and Greeks.

III. From the death of Alexander, A. C. 321, to the death of Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt, A. C. 20 years. This period contains 301 years. At this time Egypt becomes a Roman province.

Egypt remained a province of the eastern Roman Empire, and was subject to Constantinople, till it was seized by Omar, the third caliph of the Saracens, in the year of Christ 640: the seat of his empire was Babylon. This dynasty of princes continued till the year 870, when the Egyptians set up a caliph of their own, to whom the Saracens of Spain and Africa were subject. But the government of Egypt was soon after seized by the governors or sultans of Babylon and Cairo, and the authority of caliphs or priests was abolished.

In 1160 Assarredin, general of Norradin, sultan of Damascus, subdued the kingdom of Egypt, and usurped the government of it His son Saladin conquered Mesopotamia, Palestine, Damascus, and, in the year 1190, took Jerusalem from the Christians. This prince formed a military corps, composed of boys taken in war, chiefly from the christian nations, and also purchased of the Tartars. These youths, trained to severe labor and strict discipline, formed, in time, a powerful army; and they were called Mamalukes, which word signifies slave. The Janizaries, afterwards formed by the Turkish emperors, were procured and trained much in the same manner.

These Mamalukes became the scourge and terror of the times in which they lived, till, in 1242, they set one of their number on the throne of Egypt. The Mamalukes governed Egypt till 1501, when they were conquered by Selimus II. emperor of the Ottoman Turks. Since that time Egypt has been a Turkish province, governed by a viceroy from Constantinople.

There is not a regular account of the rise and progress of Egypt, into a kingdom, to be found in history, on which full reliance can be placed. The expanded narratives of Herodotus and Diodorus open before us a wide field of conjecture, in which are interspersed many important facts. But Egypt first comes to our hand in history a powerful monarchy, full of people, of prodigious wealth, learned, superstitious, and august.

It is impossible to say whether Ham, the second son of Noah, conducted this settlement in company with Misraim, his son; but it is certain that Egypt was anciently called the land of Ham: and by the Arabians and others it is still called the land of Mesre, from Misraim. its king.

Ancient Egypt lay in three divisions: Lower Egypt, or the Delta, as the Greeks called it, because shaped like their D, lay next to the Mediterranean sea, and was formed into that shape by the branching of the river Nile. The ancient capital of this was Heliopolis (City of the Sun.) Middle Egypt lays South of this. Its capital was Memphis, very anciently; and afterwards Cairo, which rose out of the ruins of the ancient Memphis, and stood on the West, as Cairo stands on the East side of the Nile.

The southern division of Egypt, which lay bordering on Ethiopia, at first made the most splendid figure in history; and Thebes, allowing half for exaggeration, must have been a greater city than is now in Europe.

During the first period of Egyptain history, mentioned in the preceding analysis, the reigns of nearly thirty princes are mentioned, but not in the exact order of succession; that, with many other things, is buried in the oblivion of antiquity. The first distinguished event, in this period of 1668 years, was the invasion of Egypt by the shepherd kings.

I. The invasion of the shepherd kings is but very imperfectly known. It was about this time that Abraham, the renowned patriarch, arrived in Egypt, with his consort, Sarah, the fame of whose beauty attracted the notice of the king of Egypt. But the sequel of that simple and eloquent story, as related in the book of Genesis, showed Pharaoh to have been under the influence of a purer morality, than usually governs arbitrary and despotic princes.

But from the history of Abraham, it appears that shepherds in those days were both powerful and opulent. Abraham, with his three friends, and their collected train of servants, were able to pursue and rout an army, commanded by several kings. The shepherd's occupation was then great and honorable, and it was by a confederation of powerful pastoral princes that Egypt was at length invaded,

and all Lower Egypt subdued. These shepherd kings were followed by a hardy, robust, and warlike race of men, whom the dangers of the wilderness had rendered brave and active, and frequent encounters with the fiercest of the beasts of the forest, had made skilful in the use of arms.

The people settled on the luxurious plains of the Nile were, indeed, numerous, but ease and abundance had made them effeminate. And what nation can resist the fascinations of wealth, or the circean cup of luxury? We have before us the cause of the downfal of all the powerful nations of antiquity. Luxurious wealth cannot contend with abstemious poverty. Idleness must fall before industry, and indolence before activity. The shepherds of Palestine, or, which is the same thing, the Philistines, invaded and conquered Lower Egypt, and remained in possesion of that fertile region 260 years.

II. The second important event, which falls under this period of Egyptian history, relates to its connexion with the history of the Hebrews; I mean the removal of the family of the patriarch Jacob into Egypt. This event, according to Archbishop Usher, took place in the year before Christ 1706.

III. The reign and conquests of Sesostris forms, by far, the most splendid era of this period of Egyptian history. Whilst he was on an expedition against the Arabians, his father died, and immediately, it is said, he formed the vast design of conquering the world. This was about the year 1491 before Christ. The officers of his army were formed out of those youths who had been educated with him, trained to every martial exercise, and inspired with the love of glory. He first subjugated the most considerable nations of Africa, and made them tributary.

A flee of 400 sail was equipped, and hastened down the Red Sea, the ports and shores of which he took care to secure; and, after vast preparations, he moved into Asia, through the Isthmus of Suez, with an army of six hundred thousand foot, twenty-seven thousand chariots, and twenty thousand horse. How this immense army could be supported in a march to India beyond the Ganges, the writers of history must leave for their readers to discover, if they can. Herodotus declares, that in every part of Asia Minor he saw the monuments of the victories of Sesostris. History makes him victorious wherever he went. He returned, at length, to Egypt, enriched with the spoils of the most opulent nations in the world, together with an immense multitude of captives. Sesostris drew a plan of his marches and encampments; and this, it is believed, was the first attempt of any thing like a general map that ever was made. Eratosthenes, the first Grecian geographer, was aided by this rude outline of Sesostris. The name of Sesostris is ranked with those of Hercules, Bacchus, Semiramis, Cyrus, Alexander, Gengis Khan, and Tamerlane, each of whom, in their day, marched through these countries, spreading misery and desolation, covered their souls with blood of millions, and seemed determined to wrest from death himself his legitimate title of *king of terrors*.

The reign of this great prince was long, and marked with signal prosperity. It is recorded, to his honor, that he was as mild and benignant to his subjects as he was terrible to his enemies; and though he filled Egypt with splendid monuments of his power, he imposed no labor nor exorbitant exactions on his subjects.

IV. If we except Sesostris, the ancient kings of Egypt were not remarkable as warriors. Their successive reigns were, however, distinguished by those monuments which have been able to resist the rage of elements, the desolations of war, and the lapse of numerous years. Very many of them still triumph over time and decay, and, for any thing we can discover, might last a thousand ages. But in, viewing these lofty remains of antiquity, we are led to reflect on the mind, temper, and genius of the people by whom they were constructed. Egypt is very beautifully styled the cradle of science: and the Egyptians were a stately, grave, and contemplative people. Their ideas of dignity bordered on solemnity and superstition. A gloomy grandeur overspread their minds, which were fond of mystery, religion, and especially of the occult sciences of astrology and divination.

V. From the reign of Sesostris the Egyptian monarchy rather declined in power and splendour; and in the latter periods of the Assyrian empire, it was partially, if not wholly, subjected to Babylon, though not permanently. Egypt preserved its independence till in the reign of Cambyses, the son and successor of the great Cyrus. Invaded by that prince, it made a feeble resistance, and Psammenitus was taken with his capital, Memphis, and Egypt become a province of the Persian empire; in which state it remained 204 years. This forms the second period of Egyptian history.

Egypt, during the period before us, presents us with the struggles and conflicts of the Greeks and Persians for empire. This great contest was terminated and closed in the triumph and death of Alexander. Conquest, in ancient times, was more easily made and lost than at the present day. The Egyptians, in the troubles that succeeded the short and disasterous reign of Cambyses, revolted and threw off the Persian yoke; nor were they fully reduced and provinciated till in the second year of the reign of Xerxes the Great, 484 years before Christ. About 40 years after the partial conquest of Cambyses, Xerxes the Great marched into Egypt, completed the conquest of that once flourishing kingdom, and reduced it to a state of extreme bondage and depression. Eighteen years after this, the Egyptians were aided in another revolt by the Athenians, having made Inarus, prince of Lybia, their king. Artaxerxes, who was then on the throne of Persia, after losing one great army, reduced them once more to a state of abject submission. Thus during a long period, while the energies of the Persian empire were wasting away, this unhappy people made successive attempts to regain their freedom. But we shall pass over this unpleasant period, and proceed immediately to the Grecian dynasty, in which this famous people rose once more to dignity, honor, and independence. In the par-

tition of Alexander's extensive dominions, Egypt fell to Ptolemy. This celebrated prince and accomplished general was one of the four officers who shared the spoils of the world, which had been laid at the feet of Alexander. There are few princes mentioned whose history abounds with more interesting events; his whole life may be said to have been a series of great actions. He was considered, by historians, as the natural son of Philip, king of Macedon. Educated in the same court with Alexander, and personally attached to him, he resembled him in bravery, but was less cruel and ambitious. In the conquest of Persia and India, he attended Alexander, and was generally near his person, in every form of danger. He slew one of the kings of India with his own hand, and was instrumental in taking the rock Ornus, always before deemed impregnable.

This prince brought with him a great accession of territory to the Egyptian monarchy, although not remarkably ambitious of conquest. His reign was equally long and prosperous; and he had the art of uniting the glory and happiness of his subjects with his own fame. Nor were the Egyptians less happy in his successor, Ptolemy Philadelphus. This monarch restored Egypt to its ancient ascendancy over all kingdoms, as a school of philosophy and science. By the assistance of the celebrated Demetrius Phalerius, he formed by far the noblest library the world ever saw: in the destruction of which, in the time of Julius Cesar, the interests of literature sustained an irreparable, as well as an incomparable loss.

The dynasty of the Ptolemies, from the accession of Ptolemy (Soter, as he was surnamed) till the death of Cleopatra, continued upwards of 290 years, the whole of which period comprehended but eleven reigns. The Ptolemies must have reigned, on an average, twenty-seven years; probably, the longest average reigns known in history.

The fortunes of this ancient and powerful people were now verging towards their last and interminable decline. The nations whom the Greeks conquered were made better; those conquered by the Romans were utterly ruined. After the two first Ptolemies, no one of that race of princes was distinguished by any very remarkable virtue or excellence. Several of them were remarkable for nothing but their vices.

The unfortunate Cleopatra, thought by some to have been the most accomplished and fascinating woman in all antiquity, was the last of the successors of Alexander, who governed Egypt. In the fame of her beauty, and the extremity of her misfortunes, she bears a strong resemblance to Mary, Queen of Scotland; and we must say, with the eloquent Hume, her vices are forgotten in her unparalleled sufferings. Julius Cesar had already partially conquered Egypt. But the final conflict for the empire of the world was to take place between Octavius and Mark Antony; and that conflict was occasioned by the arts of this perfidious beauty. Anthony had abandoned the virtuous and accomplished Octavia, the sister of Octavius, afterwards Augustus. Their quarrel was decided in a battle

at sea, near Actium. Anthony, defeated, fled into Egypt, and there put an end to his own life. Cleopatra, to avoid the disgrace of being carried to Rome in triumph, caused herself to be bitten by a serpent, of which she died

Of the revolution of Egypt, after she became a Roman province, we take no notice in the analysis of history.

It is with nations as with individuals, they have their youth, their childhood, their decline. A glance, into the vale of antiquity, where we may survey the fleeting forms of nations and empires, inspires a pleasing melancholy. We are ready to say of a Sesostris, O that he had been as good as he was great; and of a Cleopatra, O that she had been as virtuous as she was beautiful. Let us rise up from this contemplation of other times, with the reflection that this is our day—our time and place of action."

*Essex, Va. April 4th,* 1830.

Dear Brother Campbell,

I HAVE no doubt that it is your wish to know how the Millennial Harbinger is generally received by your readers, and the community at large that examine it. Your essays upon the different topics treated upon, as well as your strictures upon Clopton and Converse's brotherly communication before published, and Mr. Rogers' "mountain in labor," are read with much interest. We believe you have exposed the hypocrisy and mysticism of these gentlemen. I need not apprize you of the great efforts that are made (by those who have played the sleight of hand with the people for such a length of time) to render you and the friends of the ancient order of things and the ancient gospel, as obnoxious to society as possible. The *little* Christian Baptist having shaken them to their very foundation, they have concluded, I suppose, by the Rule of Three, that if this *little* work has produced such effects, double its size will certainly dethrone them. You will see two *little* writers have appeared in the Herald against "A Disciple." Could these gentry have stated the truth, I should not have thought any thing of their strictures. Look at the Religious Herald of the 4th December last, under the signature of "A Disciple," and the correct remarks of the Editor on the views of "A Disciple." Then look at the same paper of the 12th of March, and behold the palpable misrepresentation of "A Disciple's" views in the very sentence under the signature of "H." The whole of his communication is as true as the first sentence. Look at the Religious Herald, 26th February, under the signature of "Rechab." See his statement contradicting the statement of "A Disciple." Then look at the Religious Herald of the 19th March, at "Explanation," and you will see how much truth these gentlemen can speak in behalf of a friend and brother, who has the independence to resist the traditions of the elders. This last, "Rechab," was the *little* man, with you at my house, and at the Bowling Green, who said you perverted the word of God by saying that in the 26th and 27th verses, Rom. viii. the spirit there mentioned was not the Holy Spirit, and he wanted no

fellowship with you or any of the friends of such doctrine. "H." is one of the most dogmatical men that can be found in the neighborhood. Often he has to spell his words before he can read a sentence correctly. This at least was the case when I heard him some three or four years ago. These men have many of the members of their church (as they belong to the same church) under their thumb. They dare not go to hear you, or any friend to the ancient apostolic gospel, without incurring their frowns. They are using unhallowed means to prejudice the mind sof all against you; they catch at straws; and by some magical art make a fiery serpent of them to alarm the people. This being the case, and knowing the condition and opposition of Old Virginia against those who attempt to meddle with what they call their civil rights, I have thought it my duty to inform you that your readers are not pleased with your touching the subject of *slavery* any further than the New Testament authorizes you to teach the duty of servants and masters to each other. This is a delicate question among *us*. You can offer no argument that could convince us more than we are already convinced of the evil. It is like a painful sore—it will not bear either a stroke or pressure of the hand without rousing the angry passions of our nature. It is unavoidable now—we were not the cause of it. And the great question with us, in our private circles, is, How shall we relieve ourselves from this curse? To discuss this matter publicly would be productive of serious consequences, in the opinions of many. This your opponents know. If they sacrifice their own veracity and wrest the word of God to carry their point to sustain themselves, I should not be surprised if they were to make use of your sentiments, among the slaves, to produce an excitement in order to raise the hue and cry against the friends of the ancient order. I have found that, on several occasions, the public mind was fast progressing in ameliorating the condition in which slaves are placed, and has been thrown back by the agitation of this question by some of the eastern states, or in congress. The state of this class is such that they will not bear any hint in their favor without becoming rebellious. Their masters have been compelled to use rigid means to keep them in subjection. The agitation of the question has always terminated to the injury of the slaves. Though they are slaves, thousands and tens of thousands are happier than their masters, and much better off than nine-tenths of the free negroes. I heard a slave not long since arguing about the condition of free negroes. He remarked that "these poor devils, as he called them, were half naked and half starved, and were obliged to be sold every year to pay their taxes; while he had no trouble to provide his food, or raiment, or pay taxes or physicians; his good master fed and clothed him well. When he was sick he had a physician and all the necessary comforts of life. He took a pleasure in doing his master's will." Society with us frowns upon the man that does not feed, clothe, and treat his servants well. Their dress and appearance on the Lord's day demonstrate their superior advantages above the free negroes and poor white people.

*I am opposed to hereditary slavery, as you know.* My sentiments are before the public, and frequently discussed in private. If we are left to ourselves we hope that the light we are enjoying from the press on the christian religion will enable us all to unite, in a *private way*, to open a door for the ultimate release of this people. I consider slavery incompatible with our free republican institutions. The greatest evil that the slaves labor under, is, they cannot be educated to raise them to a standing in society, without some danger of a serious consequence to their owners. This is one proof to me of its being impracticable in this enlightened age. While the Macedonian cry is about heathens, &c. &c. with the thousands of dollars spent to no good purpose, if we would look under our own noses and hands, we should see objects that have a greater claim upon our philanthropy. I have, a few days past, received a letter from an intelligent Bishop of the Baptist Church, who knew my views towards this people, desiring that we should unite our councils in opening a door to give a tone to society, *privately and prudently as possible*, for the ultimate release of *them* and *us* from the condition in which we are placed. I wrote him that I was ready to unite with all that were friendly to such a course, upon the following conditions:—That we should enter into an agreement, binding ourselves and heirs, that, after the year 1835 or '40, as may be agreed on, we would make a record of all our female slaves then living, and every child born after that day should be born free, and should be free at the age of 21 or 24, as agreed on; that they should then receive $25 or $50 to emigrate directly to St. Domingo, or to Africa, as they chose, and not to be considered free so long as they refused to leave the United States. This is a short sketch of my plan. It cannot affect materially the present generation, nor can I see any evil consequences growing out of it, any more than a poor father's poverty would produce unhappiness to him at the prospect that his sons and daughters would one day be rich. I find in our private circles many are disposed to enter into such an agreement. My apprehension is, if much is said in our public journals, it will retard, instead of promoting our noble object. You will see, from my communication, it will be best to say as little as possible upon that subject.

All your readers around me are pleased with the Harbinger, except on slavery. So far as I have heard from the dictatorial persecuting priesthood (who know it will expose their ignorance and folly in attempting to teach the christian religion, and yet stand more in need of being taught themselves than their hearers) you may expect opposition from them and their tools. We know you regard not their revilings, nor their anathemas. They cannot maintain the present order of things; either by reason or revelation. It can be done in no other way than that adopted by the Pope of Rome and his minions—prejudicing the people against hearing, reading, and understanding the simplicity and purity of the gospel. The great innovator Time, will put them all out of the *chair*, and the kingdom "shall be taken by the *saints* of the Most High, and they shall possess the kingdom, and reign even forever and forever. Amen." T.

*Response to "T."*

I NEVER was deterred from doing what I conceived my duty, because of a patronage promised for not doing it; or threatened to be withdrawn if I did it. Such a character has not marked my course. But I only request my friends to wait till I have transgressed the rule which christian benevolence and christian prudence teach. A very considerable part of the object I contemplated to gain will be gained if the course suggested by this brother is only begun. I rejoice to know that this subject is so well understood by our Eastern brethren, who are surrounded with this population; and I have been long of the opinion that the impertinent interference of some in the free states has rather retarded than advanced the amelioration of the condition of slaves. I only again request not to be condemned in anticipation of what I may say. When I have spoken amiss, then call me to account. I hope not to afford cause to my opponents to illuminate their houses, because I have defeated myself in a great enterprize—to restore true religion and true humanity to a people spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit, by the traditions of men, and by a subordination to the rudiments of this world. EDITOR.

*Bloomfield, Nelson co. Ky.* April 8, 1830.

*Bishop Campbell*—PLEASE correct, in your next number, the name *Samuel* to *Ebenezer* Rogers, who is the writer of the Mount Pleasant Circular. I am personally acquainted with him. He is considered by those best acquainted with him, to be an honest, upright, industrious man, possessing but little of this world's goods—not a hireling; for although he has been laboring in the Missouri as an Evangelist for nearly ten years, he has probably not received for his services altogether one hundred dollars.

You also do him injustice in connecting Doctors Noel and Wilson with him in writing the Circular, as he is, perhaps, as good, if not a better scholar and writer than either of them; and they live nearly 400 miles apart. It is to be hoped that you will afford him an opportunity, through your columns, to defend his character and principles; and if you should be able to manage him, you need not fear the Doctors.

Further, you have promised to give your opponents a chance. Let Ebenezer Rogers have fair play, and I shall be deceived if he does not convince you and your readers that he is neither a dishonest man, nor a novice in the scriptures. S. M.

## EXTRAORDINARY LONGEVITY.

DIED, at Spanishtown, Jamaica, on the 21st of November, Mrs. *Judith Crawford*, aged *one hundred and fifty-one years*. She had the powers of her bodily strength, as well as her faculties, until within a few years since, and they were not so much diminished as to reduce her to second childishness. She remembered the dreadful earthquake of 1692. *Religious Herald.*

*Monthly Receipts for the Millennial Harbinger.*

William Hayden paid for S Edwards, 2 dollars; D Hook, Louisville, Ga paid 2 dollars; J Young, Pittsburgh, Pa paid 2 dollars; S M Bagby, paid for himself and G T Wood, 2 dollars each; G W Trabue; Glasgow, Ky paid for W Ritter, J Eubank, F M'Millan, J Wooten, and S C Scrivener, 2 dollars each; Thomas Bullock, Versailles, Ky paid for S G Henry, D Craig, W L Griddy, S Nuckles, and J M Dupey, $2 each; J W Jeffrey's, Jeffreys' Store, paid for himself and J A Hetchell, 2 dollars each; J Neal, Pleasant Grove, Va paid two dollars, T M Henley, Lloyd's, Va paid for J Lumpkin, G W Gatewood, W Temple, S C Gatewood, and L Striggle, 2 dollars each; S G Shropshire, Augusta, Ky paid 2 dollars; R M'Clure, Wheeling Va paid for S Bowry, 2 dollars; W Shepherd, Georgetown, Ohio; paid $1; J Mendal, Wellsburg, Va paid for J Hunter, Jun. R Starr, and J Berry, 2 dollars each; also, 1 dollar for R Moore; W Bootwright, Richmond, Va for himself, J Bootwright, J Shock, C H Hyde, M Baker, J Winn, T H Fox, B F Lester, J D Davis, C Carter, O Ellison, S D Crenshaw, A Thomas, W D Wrenn, J L Tate, W B Clark, J Winston, Short Pump, J Jennings, Cartersville, H Eidson, Staunton, N H Coleman, Mount Horeb, W C Nelson, and T Hunt, White Chimneys, 2 dollars each; Charles King, Sen. Irville, Ohio, paid 2 dollars; J Radford, Oak Grove, Ky paid for A Titterington, G W Davis, E A Lucy, and J Thacher, 2 dollars each; A T Payne, Washington, Ky paid 2 dollars; S Carpenter, Bardstown, Ky paid for himself and H Gore, 2 dollars each; W Poston, Winchester, Ky paid for T C Gordon, H T Chevis, O Collins, and J Morton; 2 dollars each; J T Jones, Cincinnati, Ohio, paid for J Sparks, W Robinson, and Lawson, 2 dollars each; M P Wheat, Columbia Ky paid for himself, J P Smith, W Dudley, B F Hall, Thomas Massie, sen. and J Steel, 2 dollars each; G Brite, Waynesville, Ohio, paid two dollars; Amos Kirkpatrick, Meigsville, Ten. paid for J Drasser and L Bransford, 2 dollars each; B Stanton, Mount Pleasant, Ohio, paid 2 dollars; N L Lindsey, North Middletown, Ky. paid for E Darnall, two dollars; J Philips, Steubenville, Ohio, paid for J Miller, 2 dollars; J Y Bassett Huntsville, Ala paid for T J Summer and himself, 2 dollars each; Nathan Ewing, Nashville, Ten paid 4 dollars for vols 1 and 2, S D Early, Thomas Rennolds, and Thomas Porter, Flemingsburg, paid 2 dollars each; Dr Charles Merriwether, Hadensville, Ky. paid for himself 4 dollars for vols 1 and 2, and J T Gilner, 2 dollars; D Kellough, Bloomington Ind paid for himself and D Travis, 2 dollars each; J Warren, Leesburg, Ky paid 2 dollars; H Langley, Washington, Pa paid for Elder C Wheeler, 2 dollars; F V Sutton, White Chimnies, paid for B B Wright, 2 dollars; Richard Seaton, Floyd's Fork, Ky paid for R Welsh, J Mill, P B Garret, J Pound, J W Tyler, A Horton, A Rose, J A Sweney, G Seator, C D Seator, and Mary Payne, 2 dollars each, B H Payne, Mount Sterling, Ky. paid for three subscribers, 6 dollars; G Butler, Butler's Geo paid for V H Walker, 2 dollars; J W Jeffreys, paid for W Richards. Spanish Grove, Va 2 dollars; J A Watson, Prince Edward Court-House, 2 dollars; R Sanders, Mile Grove, Va 2 dollars, J Eaton, Bennington, Ohio, paid 2 dollars.

☞Several valuable articles, excluded from this number, will appear in our next. *Orioli and Discipulus*, we regret, came too late for this number. I hope these correspondents will often favor us with communications.

*Erratum.*—Page 165. line 1, for "*brother*," read *christian*.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL.—PRICE, $2 IN ADVANCE.

# THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 5. | BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, MAY 5, 1830. | Vol. I.


I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

*Brother Campbell,*

IF you think it worthy of a place in the *Millennial Harbinger*, you will confer a favor by inserting in your next number the following paraphrastic meditation, suggested by reading the ninth chapter of the book of Proverbs: —

This chapter describes, in a very majestic manner, the nature, qualities, and effects of true religion, under the personification of "Wisdom;" and pictures, in contrast, the semblance of Wisdom, where the reality is not, by the delineation of a "foolish woman." We talk not of the use of prosopopœia. We avoid the usual common places. We advert directly to the character of genuine piety. The service of God, necessarily, is magnificent. Wisdom's house is upheld and decorated by the mystical number of pillars. The accepted worshipper EXPERIENCES the glory of the service when his affections swell and elevate themselves to the communion of "God's inhabitation." He is not satisfied with the ready and appropriate use of words *only*—even sacred and spiritual words. His spirit seeks after God and finds the God of his righteousness. He seeth him that is invisible, and is mentally present with his Maker's perfections. He looks on, and loves, and wonders at the incomprehensible God. He needs no human voice to tell him that Wisdom's house is a splendid edifice. He sees Zion, and the light of God shining on her palaces and towers, and he sings, "This is the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God!" Seek, O my soul, to equal Elijah's celestial voyage in his fiery chariot! O seek dilligently to enjoy the enlarging influence of the Spirit of Truth—the Guide of the horsemen and chariots of Israel!

The provision of her festive table is most abundant. Viands the most substantial, and cordials the most cheering, are prepared. That which maketh glad the heart of God and man is in abundance. It is a marriage feast, and there is "wine" to exhilarate the spirits of the company. The table is furnished, and "all things are ready." The understanding of the saint is enriched with divine light—revealed truth, the abiding and imperishable substance. Ample sources of intellectual and moral gratification are provided, and the fountain of

illumination is opened to the soul. The joys of God's presence inspire and exalt, so that the mouth is full of the high praises of Immanuel, and all around are wondering to hear the believers speak the wonderful works of God. The mockers say, "These men are full of new wine," and though ignorantly and maliciously, yet truly do they speak. Yea, it is wine which "Wisdom" hath mingled—the very *new* wine of the kingdom of God. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." What a glorious supper, and because of the glory of him who gives the entertainment! Think, O my soul, of the honor, the privilege, and happiness of thus associating with Jesus—to listen to his conversation—to recline upon his bosom—to hear his voice—to acquire his manners—to be filled with his love! "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth: for thy love is better than wine!" O the holy raptures of the sanctified heart, when "the King hath brought his beloved into his chambers, and his banner over her is love." The profane may not attempt to penetrate this mystery. "This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church." Into this holy place the chosen generation, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, the peculiar people, are able to look. Touch not, with unhallowed hands, the ark of God, lest ye die. Let the children of *Wisdom*, the heirs, the sons who were lost, but are found, draw near, and eat of the fatted calf and be glad. Ye have bread to eat which the world knoweth not of. Eat, my beloved, and drink abundantly, and let your souls delight themselves in fatness; for behold it is true that the Great King has made a marriage feast for his Son, and ye are invited; nay, more, it is written and sealed with the King's ring, to give assurance to young and old, little children and women, that "whosoever will, may take the water of life freely." What a glorious favor!—"Called to the marriage supper of the Lamb!"

How affecting the free and hearty welcome proffered to *all!* Even and specially are the "simple" urged to become Wisdom's guests; the single in heart, who are separated from all other loves and attachments, "that they should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead." Forsake the dead, O my soul, and cleave unto the Living—the Risen—the Glorified. Abandon thy follies, and embrace the wisdom of God. To turn aside from the path of madness and death, and let the knowledge of the Most High be thy light, and the Life of Men be thy life, and love, and spouse forever! "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh." "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." "Is not the Church of God the virtuous woman whose price is far above rubies? Shall not her own works praise her in the gates? Once again—Ye ends of the earth, hear the voice of Wisdom's maidens;—the Spirit and the Bride say, "Come!" "If any man thirst, let him come to the volume of inspiration and drink." Shout it from the mountain top, and proclaim it from the high places of the city, that in "God manifest in the flesh," there is

ample salvation for the vilest—the chief of sinners! "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him turn unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God who will abundantly pardon!"

The truly pious have been made *wise*. They *know* God and his Christ, the Prince of Peace. The carnal and religious follies of the world around them have been forsaken and renounced. They are "*alive*" unto God, and try to please him in *all* things. Universally are they distinguished by regular, steady *advancement* in wisdom and holiness, under the tuition of the Great Teacher. "The wise man becomes yet wiser." They bear reproof with gratitude, being always glad to exchange error for truth, and ignorance for knowledge. Never too wise to be taught, nor too proud to confess their ignorance, they daily attain and press forward towards being "filled with all the fulness of God." Lord! teach thou me the way of thy statutes, and lead me in the path of thy commandments; make me more wise, holy, and happy every day, that I may also be more humble, meek, and docile! This process is sustained until the Spirit inscribe over against their names in the Lamb's book of life, "*They are all taught of God!*" Blessed, thrice blessed disciples of divine wisdom and teaching! Surely in that temple which Wisdom has reared, ye shall eat and drink and be merry, and "your days shall be multiplied, and the years of your lives shall never end." Is not this the heritage of the servants of the Lord!!

The contrast compels me "to change my voice." "A FOOLISH WOMAN" is the well selected emblem of all false religions, and chiefly of those which *pretend* to be the gospel of the favor of God. She is "clamorous," noisy and talkative, and an ignorant simpleton withal. Few things more decisively determine the irreligious state of those who *seem* to be religious, than their ungoverned and babbling tongue. ☞He is at this moment an unbeliever in Christ's glory, and honor, and authority; and in the judgment to come, who hath not realized the bridle and the watch on mouth and lips, so plainly imposed and required by the Lawgiver in his teaching! Religious he may be, but it is a *vain* religion he possesses; and when the *whole* truth is brought to bear on his moral standing, he will come into condemnation before the perfect law of liberty. "If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body." This is required by that gospel, by the faith of which we are saved, if we keep in memory the things which we have heard. Reader, the nominal christianity of this day admits, with the exception of profaneness lying, and other impolite and vulgar uses, the tongue is our own, (or the pen—the press,) and in that respect there is no Lord over us.—Gracious God! inscribe it on our consciences that *all uses of the tongue, which do not bring grace unto the hearer, are forbidden,* ON PENALTY OF ETERNAL DEATH! This *principle* must be received into the heart, or faithfully adhered to in life, or in the end the tongue will be found "full of deadly poison." The "religion" which admits of idle, malicious, vain, or fashionable talk, instead of the wisdom that

cometh from above, is a something "earthly, sensual, and devilish." It is directly and throughout opposed to heavenly truth. While the tongue is untamed, or its issues are of a *mixed* character, the fruit of righteousness is not sown, and there can be no true "peace." Mark well, we say, of a *mixed* character. Few, indeed, would suppose themselves religious if there were *no* seasons in which it was their inclination, purpose, or pleasure to talk religiously. The religious world has not *yet* sunk to that depth of depravity and presumption. On the contrary, they have their times and seasons, and persons and places, when, with whom, and where their mind *takes on* the pious complexion, and religion (such as it is) is the topic of discussion.—They have *experiences* (monkish, stale, and filthy dreams) for the experimental; *doctrines* for the systematic; and *anecdotes* for the trifling. In their recollections, Paul and Calvin, Shakspeare and Wesley are rivals, as teachers of truth, and discerners of human nature; while after many years profession, they are ignorant of the Scriptures of truth. They can talk politics with the students of the "news," and sport an opinion on the last novel, or latest fashion, among the votaries of pride; they can be light, trifling, or profane, when politeness, custom, or conviviality require that formality to the spirit of the impenitent; they can be zealous for the *great* cause of modern superstition; sentimental in the sick room; and in extacies under the voice of the dear good *feeble* man, who furnishes a weekly apology for their fashionable and sinful infirmities, and assures them of heaven in recompense of their adherence to *his* sect! But enough! These are the pious, and devout, and honorable of this generation.—These are the *members in communion* of the Churches of the General Assembly and Church of Babylon the Great. Of the religion of Jesus, as stated and enforced in the New Testament, they *know* nothing, and are, of course proud of their piety. It is true, by the help of the clergy, they "justify themselves" in the rejection of God's counsel, and will not justify God, by submitting to the baptism of the New Testament for the forgivenesss of sins. "Foolish women!" virgins having no oil in their vessels, and clamorously exclaiming in the day of trial and of death, "*Give us of your oil!*" Ah! and so their lamps are goneout. They *knew* nothing after all their clamor.—They did not know that a lamp while burning needed to be fed by a fresh supply of oil. They *supposed* (a term which describes the *hope* of modern christianity) that the original stock must last for ever; and until the damps of death fastened upon their taper, and they were only undeceived when enveloped in the blackness of darkness! O what folly and madness! "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye *double* minded; be afflicted, and mourn, and weep; let your laughther be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness." "Come out of her (Babylon—the popular religions of the day) my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues! "AND SHE SHALL BE UTTERLY BURNED WITH FIRE!" Is not this an indication that more is involved in union with these secular, carnal, and worldly *churches*, than, (as the Scribes insinuate,)

a *mere trifling difference of opinion.* O that the people understood and believed this! Is it not frightful to see the multitude resting satisfied with the *word* of a modern Babylonish priest or parson, while he confounds all moral distinctions, and assures his "silly sheep" that one ordinance is as good as another—one doctrine as true and saving as its opposite—one church as much the church of God as any that could be created by the Apostles' doctrine—that sprinkling is as good as baptism—or, if not, CHARITY is greater than all things, and will cover the multitude of sins! No! says the Spirit, your false charity, and the fables and inventions it covers, shall be utterly burned with fire! That false, talking, selfish, dreaming CHARITY FOR ALL, which mars the beauty of truth, and removes the landmarks of Jehovah's inheritance, must carry its disciples, and subjets, and teachers down to the lake which burneth. This is the end of the popular religionists; and why? *"For strong is the Lord God who judgeth her"—the foolish woman!*

Another peculiarity: Instead of shamefacednesss and humility, "she sitteth at the door of her house, on a seat in the high places of the city, to call passengers who go right on their ways." The Saviour marked the hypocrites of his day by their securing to themselves the chief seats in the synagogue. True to its nature, self-deceit is uniformly ambitious, seeking the pre-eminence, and demanding as a right that it shall be greatest. Modern piety is a boasting, emulous, and proselyting thing, full of high-sounding pretensions, and always more disposed to increase its *sect*, than in any case to rejoice in the diffusion and influence of the truth. A thousand conversions, instead of filling the *foolish woman's* heart with joy and gladness, would not be listened to with patience, unless effected by *her* missionaries, and *her* preachers, and for *her* denomination. And let it be understood that several thousands have rejected the doctrines, creeds, and traditions of men, and have begun to *understand* the word of the living God; and the reformation, the converts, the work of God, and the welfare of the human family, are all alike the objects of her scorn. The gospels of human obligation are her delight; but the plain, practical gospel, as taught and believed by the Apostles of our Lord, is, and must be denounced, as false and heretical, in obedience to the basest passions, and bitterest alienation from God! This modern orthodoxy cannot *tolerate* the passengers who go on the right way, if they refuse to turn into *her* house, and learn wisdom and understanding as *she* is pleased to prescribe. What avails the love of the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, even though followed up by all fidelity and moral courage, in the estimation of the modern sectarian, so long as the individual will be FREE according to the truth taught by the Son of God! To realize the esteem of the *moderns*, you must be a party man; wear the nickname zealously; and shut your eyes against every ray of light which might suggest the *necessity* of distinguishing between loving as our heavenly Father loves, and "loving them *only* who love you!" O! Bigotry! thou presiding genius of bloodshed and pollu-

tion! The valley of Hinnom is the garden of thy delights. Surely the "dead are there, and thy guests are in the depths of hell."

The last and most striking feature of the "foolish woman," is the encouragement of her lovers to commit and enjoy secret sins. "Stolen waters are sweet." The *Christian* is a hater of sin, for its *sinfulness*, in his *heart*, and because of the fear of the Lord. His standard of right and wrong is *not* the opinion of his fellow-creature. As he seeks not the honor which cometh from man, so he cannot be satisfied with having pleased men. It is not enough for him to secure a standing in the congregation or in the world, as one that is pious and good, for he must *first* secure the approbation and smile of his God. Early did he learn that "*the knowledge of the holy is understanding*," and he continues to esteem and prize *all* things according as they are holy. Sin is no more to be tolerated by him because it is *secret*, than the *pious devices* of the foolish woman because they are *popular*. "Waters" that had been "stolen" could in *no* instance be "sweet," for he *must* despise and avoid that bread which *must* be eaten in secret.—The gracious sense of self-respect which the "wise" entertain for their bodies, cause, vocation, and destiny, raises the Christian above the possibility of secret iniquity. He cannot submit to the degradation of concealment. His God is the Father of Lights—he is himself the child of the light. His deeds he habitually brings to the light to have them approved, and he directs his course to that region where all is light; yea, everlasting light, and the true God the glory!

Modern religion is the reverse of all this. Who dare deny the application of what follows to this *present* generation? A name to live—a standing in the "meeting"—the honor coming from men—and a reliance on men's devices, to the exclusion of God's holy word—are not these the ends and aims? The loudest professions, and the most *approved* too, are coupled with the worst lives, if men's lives are to be measured by a *spiritual* commandment. If sin is to be committed, it is enough that the discipline does not reach it, or that the criminal cannot be convicted of the fact. Hence the frauds, evasions, and pretexts used in money matters—the drunkenness—the gluttony—the show—domestic disquietudes—relative clamors—and social pollutions, that are constantly preying on the vitals of the so called Christian community. Yea, the adulterer waiteth for the twilight, when, under pretext of piety and mercy, the heart of a silly woman may be ensnared and laden with divers lusts. O my God, let the people hear thy word! Let it pass into a maxim, that the popular religionist is NECESSARILY living in *secret* ungodliness, of some sort; and that, notwithstanding his *fair* show in the flesh, *he is a servant of corruption!! His conscious evil deeds keep him from the light of the reformation!* and to keep on some terms with himself he MUST (O hard destiny!) revile them who hold it up to view, and press it upon his notice. This was the *philosophy* of the case, as expounded by the Infallible Teacher sent from God!

And yet there are some in Babylon, whom God invites to his own embrace, under the appellation of "My people." It is the *wise* man

whose love is increased by the rebuke of Wisdom. Alas! for the proud haughty scorner! He will hate the reprover, and cleave so much the more closely to his corruptions. Nay, more; he will cherish the design of retaliation and revenge, as if the reprover were always malicious in his discovery of evils, and in the honest announcement of the unavoidable punishment that awaits them. As this chapter saith, "He that reproveth a scorner getteth to himself shame, and he that rebuketh a wicked man getteth himself a blot." If the *real* condition of the religious world be pointed out—if the principles which are at work in the kingdom of the clergy are unfolded—and if the scriptural analysis of revealed truth is fairly attempted—O, then, Herod and Pilate are friends in one day. The devotees of rival deities are reconciled to fight together the *great* fight against this *common* enemy of unknown gods, and all they who are no gods. The child of heavenly Wisdom, who is ready to die, but who cannot *lie*, is resisted by all the craftsmen concerned. They hold, as respects this world's honors, the keys of Hell and Death, and the honest and candid reprover is to be overwhelmed (if God permit) by the outcry of "the dogs that are without"—yes, WITHOUT decency, fairness, or moral worth! Only let a Christian professor make his appeal in *all* things to the revelation of God, taking it as a *whole*, and understanding it as every communication to the human mind *must* be understood; and it will be speedily understood, that, as he is no friend to existing abuses, he must be put down! He is not ashamed of the wisdom of God; but shame and contempt, as far as the clergy have influence, will cover him as a garment. No body cares to *know* him. His friendship is refused and repelled as an imputation. Does the good man *persist* in holding forth the truth? The sons of the foolish woman will certainly "*blot*" him—he is charged with all manner of crimes and blasphemies—he is a liar and a foe to all true religion, the moment he refuses to take his lesson from the foolish woman and her priesthood. *But a day comes when truth must be listened to.* Hypocrisy will be exposed, and the victims of delusion and vice, in spite of their *hopes*, must receive their portion with unbelievers. Then shall the wisdom of God shine forth in its unchanging glory. "Hear instruction and be *wise*, and refuse it not." All they that hate me, love death!

ORIOLE.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

*T*———, *March* 30, 1830.

MY DEAR BROTHER,

I AM now at the place from whence I received the "call" mentioned in my last. I came here on Thursday the 25th instant, and am calculating to remain till April the 12th next, and then return by P—— to S——. This is a pleasant manufacturing village, containing between 3000 and 4000 inhabitants, five meeting houses, and five different denominations, viz. Baptist, Orthodox Congregationalist, Methodist, Friend, and Christian. The Baptist church is the oldest, largest, and has the best meeting house. The Christian

church, I am told, numbers about 100 members—is Unitarian in sentiment, and from the other information received concerning them, I should judge very ignorant and enthusiastic. Were it not for the *abuse* of this holy name* I would be called by no other; but, as it is, I shall for the present, I think, hold on to my letters of commendation, certificates, &c. which call me a *Baptist.*

Some where in your Christian Baptist, I recollect, one of your correspondents said that "your opposition to the popular establishments of the present day, missionary associations, the clergy, their salaries, &c. &c. had secured to you the covetous, the irreligious, and Christless Christians; that if any before were real Christians, they ceased to enjoy their religion on embracing your views." I recollect also another said that "your writings had well nigh stopped all missionary operations in this state," or to this amount. Now, my dear brother, I have feared that such, in numerous instances, was the effect; that numbers of the covetous, irreligious, and Christless Christians read your works with avidity, and called you *Master*, and took occasion from what you had published, to rail out not only against all "benevolent institutions," but against those, who, from the best of motives, contributed to their support—who would do nothing themselves—not a cent—for the support of the best of causes in a scriptural way. I must confess that the conviction of this being the tendency of your writings—to make and please such—operated the most powerfully on my own mind to close my eyes against the light which your Christian Baptist held out for me. While I read your writings myself, I could not feel hearty in recommending them to others—to my brethren generally. Being myself a contributor to the Bible Society, Missionary, Education Societies, and the like; and being conscious that I acted from proper motives, from a sense of duty and privilege; I could not, therefore, but encourage others to do likewise. But now let me tell you what has been their effect on me after a long, slow, and thorough examition of about FOUR YEARS—after an examination, not only of your writings, but of that *best of books* also, which they every where extol as containing *the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice:*—It has been to withdraw my patronage, since the first of January last from all these popular, religious, human institutions, and to fix my eye singly upon one of divine origin—*the church.* I now feel none the less inclined to give than before, and not to give less, to promote what I conceive to be the cause of God. No, it is my privilege to do something, and all that I can do, that the empire of Immanuel may be extended. In these feelings, I trust that, among your readers, I am not alone. Let the church of Jesus come up out of Babylon; let her shake herself from the dust; let her wash herself and put on her beautiful garments; let her cast out of her bosom all the money-lovers, boasters, proud, high-minded, and their households; then will she shine forth like the Sun! fair as the moon! and terrible as an army with banners! Then will she not need the money of the

*Did it not in this country designate a *sect*; and were not those who bore it there as much sectarians as any others?

wicked to pay her ministers; and, if offered, will refuse it. Like Peter to Simon the sorcerer, her ministers will say to all the ungodly, "Your money go with you to destruction. If you think the free gift of God may be purchased with money, you have no part or lot in this matter. Reform, therefore, from this your wickedness, and beg of God, if, perhaps, the thought of your heart may be forgiven you." Instead, then, of a Parson's taking a paper, and going about to get the pews of his meeting-house taxed to secure him a support, as I saw one doing a few days since, every door will be thrown open, and all seats become equally honorable and equally free. They will preach, "I want none of your money for religious purposes until you have given your hearts to the Lord—until you have put on Christ by being immersed into his name; and then I want it only as a contribution to the Lord, and not to man. Let it be put into the hands of the stewards of the congregation, as the Lord has prospered you, as an act of worship on the first day of the week; and then let distribution be made to those who need it."

While at E—— I became very intimately acquainted with brother W. W. A——, the Free-Will Baptist minister of that place. We frequently visited each other, and had many interesting conversations on points on which we differed. The object of both, I trust, was *truth;* and therefore we could talk of our differences without giving or receiving offence. It was not long before we exchanged pulpits on a Lord's day afternoon: and in the evening of that day I discoursed on the doctrine of election. When the exchange was agreed on I informed brother A—— of my intention to treat that subject in the evening, and wished him at the close of his meeting in our house to give public notice of it. "Well," said he, and paused—"but what if, when you get through your discourse, I should get up and tell the people to beware of brother F——'s doctrine; and ask them to come next Lord's day evening and hear me, when I would point out your errors?" "Do so," I replied, "if you think I am wrong; and after you sit down I will say to the people, Go and hear brother A——! go and hear brother A——! and then bring all that we both say to the scriptures. Prove all things: hold fast that which is good." We both gave out the appointment. In the evening brother A—— set in the desk with me, and made the first prayer; and after I had concluded my discourse I gave him opportunity to do as he had said; but he declined. The same week, however, he called and spent half a day conversing with me on this subject. Though at that time we did not and could not exactly agree, he being an Arminian and I a Calvinist; yet the difference between us, he said, was so small that he would not preach against me. We parted as we met—*friends;* and friends I trust we are at present.

The last Lord's day I spent in E—— I did not *preach* myself, but attended as a hearer of brother A——. In the evening, after opening the meeting as usual, by singing and prayer, brother A—— made some remarks on the length of time he had been a public teacher of religion—his design to direct men to the Bible, and his method of

doing this—said that he had been long tired on account of the little effect of his labors—had been led to question the propriety of *textuary* preaching, and had finally come to the conclusion from that time forth to abandon it. Then, by his request, I read to the congregation your "Preface to the Narratives of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John," and added a few extempore remarks of my own. The meeting closed with prayer by the Congregational minister of the place, Rev. Mr. G——.

Since I left E——, as I informed you in my last, I have either *read* or *talked* some in public about every Lord's day, and have talked a little on other days with some of my fathers and brethren by the fireside. They express many fears in regard to me—think that my new notions will injure my usefulness; but, to a man, they all decline reading the Christian Baptist, and will not patiently hear my defence.

Soon after going to P——, on the 1st inst. I visited a Reverend D. D.—had a little chat with him—expressed some doubts on the modern's being the best order of things—and left with him a copy of my first letter to you, your reply, vol. v. C. B. and No. 4 of vol. 6. On the last I wrote as follows:—

"Will Dr. W— have the goodness to read vol. v. herewith enclosed, and in this number the essays on the *Ancient Gospel*, and before I leave this, in the course of two weeks, oblige me with another interview.

"Sincerely seeking after the truth,

"F."

Two weeks afterwards I called and had another interview of about one hour and a half. The Doctor now returned me the book and papers unread; and I apologized for troubling him. He said that the church first formed by the Apostles was not *our* model—that what was proper and expedient in Palestine, would not do in the United States—that he did not consider sectarianism an evil (or, rather, the existence of different religious sects) in the present state of the christian church—that when the Millennium comes we may expect a change for the better. "But in reference to A. Campbell," said he, "I have not a very high opinion of him, either as a man of talents, a christian, or a Bible critic. I have not read his book—I have no time for it," &c. I showed him the first number of the Millennial Harbinger. He read, "The Destruction of Sectarianism." This, he said, was enough. He, however, turned it over a little, and then handed it back to me. I again apologized for troubling him, and made my bow and retired. "Does our law judge any man before it hear him?" said Doctor Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. "But *thou* wert altogether born in sins, and dost thou instruct us?" "And they cast him out."

Last evening I attended in this place the meeting of a Bible Class, composed chiefly of church members, both old and young. I being *pro tem.* the acting "Elder," was requested by the Deacons to take the lead. No chapter having been previously given out, I asked, What one shall we consider? Elder B——, an *Elder* indeed, a blind teacher, 75 years old, who has been the leader of this people

upwards of 30 years,) named the 13th chapter of Luke. Very well, we all turned to this chapter. After prayer I remarked that I had before me a different translation from the one in common use; and as it was desirable that we should avail ourselves of every means in our power for coming to a right understanding of the sacred oracles, if the class would look over, I would read the chapter in Dr. George Campbell's translation; after which we might note the difference, and profitably consider it. I read. The Elder sat uneasy. As soon as I got through he gave his mind unasked. 'He was an old-fashioned sort of a man,' he said, 'and liked the old Bible better.' He marked several differences. "There is *reform* for *repent*," said he. Now a person may reform, but that is not repentance. Repentance means something more. It is a very different thing. Evangelical repentance is a godly sorrow for sin, &c. &c. After speaking much against the New Translation, he called upon the Deacons to instruct me into the proper manner of conducting these meetings. I turned to them for instruction. They wished me to take my own way. I therefore proceeded to make some further remarks on this translation, to ask and answer, to hear asked and answered, questions upon the chapter.

I will only add, if not deceived, I do ardently desire to see a pure speech, the ancient gospel and ancient order of things fully restored among the people of God.

Yours in the hope of immortality,
Through a crucified Saviour,

F.

*For the Millennial Harbinger.*

## REGENERATION—*No. I.*

MAN is a singular being. His character presents at once the most distant extremes and the most striking contradictions. In his powers weak, limited, and fallible; in his ambition mighty, boundless, and persevering. Born into the world naked, destitute, dependent; we, at another period, see him in the person of an Alexander, a Cesar, or a Napoleon, clothed with regal splendor, and lording it over the destinies of nations.

Considered individually, as it regards his corporeal energies and intellectual faculties, he is in the one surpassed by the brute creation; and in the other, capable of attaining merely a knowledge of the little system of things which fall in his own way, are discerned by his senses, and his views concerning which commence and terminate in himself: while viewed as a member of the human family, he can, by the aid of language, appropriate to himself the notices, the thoughts, the powers, and the improvements of all the men of times past and present; can hear sounds made a thousand years ago, and see things done a thousand miles off; and, taught by revelation, is able to trace up his history to the beginning of time, and even to lift the curtain from the scenes of eternity!

Man was originally a noble creature. Created in the image of him who is perfect, he was declared to be "very good." Under the reigning influence of the happifying principles of *love* and *gratitude*, no discordant passions interrupted the supreme enjoyments of his nature; no unhallowed fires glowed within his breast: no base thoughts stained the purity of his mind. Forgetful of self, Pride taught him to glory in the perfections of his Creator; while Ambition, her handmaid, prompted only to a pure, perfect, and grateful obedience. Temptation had not yet assailed him: the nice balance between his reason and his passions had not yet been destroyed: the poisonous breath of deceit and falsehood had not yet tainted the innocence of the Garden of Eden!

Man has fallen. The grave alone can hide his shame! Forgetful of God, he glories in himself. Receiving all that he possesses, he boasts as if he had not received it, and claims originality. Neglecting the honor that comes from God only, the highest aim of his ambition is to obtain honor from his fellow. Himself the slave of appetite, he affects dominion, and assumes the appearance of authority. Under the mask of reason, he commits the extravagancies of the insane. A proud, vain, and irrational philosophy, has usurped the place of the knowledge of the true God; while a false and absurd superstition has superseded a religion pure and undefiled. Those passions and principles of his nature, which, when subjects, contributed to his happiness, now reigning as tyrants, increase and perpetuate his misery.

But amidst the ruins there are some vestiges of his pristine grandeur. He once governed himself. Now, conscious of his descent, and unable to recover his former empire, he endeavors to acquire another, and rules over his fellow and his equal. The amiable principles of his nature once reigned predominant. Now occasionally displaying themselves in his actions, they show that they have been concealed, but not entirely extinguished. But they languish in confinement—here striving to obtain their liberty—there enfeebled and unable to resist; or perishing amidst the cruel chains of base propensities, and the poisonous food of impure desires.

Man will be renovated. The voice of him who first spoke the universe into being, speaks once more. In accents of mercy and condescension, he cheers the languid excellencies of man's nature. He speaks, not like the Tempter, to command unruly passions to the throne; but to restore the dominion to pure and holy principles.—Coming, not as the serpent, filled with hatred, to instil the poison of the sting of death; but in a glorious exhibition of unbounded love, he excites a kindred feeling, and commands the delighted soul to love and live for ever. The evil passions strive to regain the mastery; but animated and quickened by the recollections of the love of God; stimulated by the enjoyments of his favor, and excited to perseverance by the great and precious promises of a glorious immortality, the contest continues until the whole man, soul, body, and spirit, is sanctified through the truth, enters upon the fruition of his hopes, and enjoys an everlasting crown. DISCIPULUS.

*For the Millennial Harbinger.*

## REGENERATION—*No. II.*

THE human mind is prone to mystery and superstition. Unwilling to be satisfied with things that are simple and easily discerned, it aims at the discovery of ultimate principles and relations, and trusting to the feeble bark of Reason, with Conjecture at the helm, and Pride and Interest, Ambition and Folly at the oars, is lost amidst the boundless ocean of Absurdity.

"I am jealous of you with a great jealousy, (says Paul to the Corinthians,) because I have betrothed you to one husband, to present you a chaste virgin to Christ. But I am afraid lest somehow, as the serpent beguiled Eve by his subtility, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is due to Christ."

"I wonder that ye are so soon removed from him who called you into the favor of Christ, to another gospel; which is not another, (says he to the Galatians,) but some there are who wish to pervert the glad tidings of the Christ."

Among the various subjects in the investigation of which the mystifiers of religion have departed from the simplicity of the truth, none stands more conspicuous than regeneration. Indeed, there are very few that seem to have a clear, plain, and scriptural view of the subject. And what is the reason? Because the atmosphere of Babylon has not only impaired our vision, but the smoke of the city has extended to some distance over the surrounding country, and obscured the beauty of the works of God, concealing the sweetness of the Rose of Sharon, and throwing a dusky mantle over the spotless purity of the Lily of the Valley. While in the city, scarce able to discern the Sun of Righteousness through the thick gloom which surrounded us, we were accustomed to be told by the priestly kings of the city, from their wooden thrones, that we could not possibly discover the true color of any object unless they would reflect upon it the light of the Sun, from whom (holding up a mysterious roll of genealogy) they claimed to be descended; while at the same time, clothed in *sable robes* which *absorbed* the feeble rays of light, they were entirely *incapable of reflection!* Turning away at length from these deceivers, we determined to be guided by the Sun himself, and issuing from the gates, have rejoiced in the light and liberty of the kingdom of heaven. But, as

*Habits, by long continued care impress'd,*
*Are strong as nature in the human breast,*

we are prone to consider those the true colors of objects which bear some resemblance to the hues to which we have been accustomed; and if any thing presents itself to us in its simple beauty, we are surprised, and unable or afraid to recognize it.

When, in scripture, a figure is drawn from any thing in the natural world, if we wish to understand the application of the figure, we should take into view the most striking circumstances relating to that from which the figure is taken. When the Saviour says that he is

the true vine, and that his disciples are the branches, we remember at once that in the natural world the branches of the vine derive their support from the stock, and that if separated they decay and perish. When he says, "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, the Father" (who is said to be the husbandman) "taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit he purgeth, that it may bring forth more fruit;" we bring to mind that every circumstance is literally exemplified in the conduct of the vine-dresser, who lops off from the vine the unprofitable branches, and from those branches that bear fruit the withering or exuberant twigs, that they may bring forth more abundantly.

If we pursue the same simple course in considering the subject of regeneration, the difficulties which have hitherto involved the subject will vanish as the darkness of twilight before the effulgence of the orb of day.

Nicodemus erred in taking up the figure literally; that is, in supposing the birth which the figure was intended to explain, to be the same with that from which the figure was taken. The Saviour corrects the error by declaring to him that a second birth according to the flesh would be of no advantage. "That," says he, "which is born of the flesh is flesh." As he declared at another time, "the flesh profits nothing: it is the Spirit that quickens." "That which is born of the Spirit," continues he, "is spirit. Assuredly I say to you, unless a man be born of water and Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Let us consider the figure: In the natural world a man is born of that from which he proceeds, and of that by which he is begotten.

So in the spiritual world, a man who is born again has come forth from water as from the womb, having been previously begotten by the Spirit.

It is strange that the plainest declarations of the scriptures on this subject have so long passed almost unnoticed. Does not Paul declare to the Corinthians that he (the instrument of the Holy Spirit, and speaking as the Spirit gave him utterance,) "had begotten them through the gospel"? Does not Peter declare to the children of God, that they had "been regenerated, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, through the word of the living God, which remains forever? Now," says he, "this is that word which has been proclaimed as glad tidings to you." Does not James say to the christians, that "God, according to his own will, had begotten them by the word of truth"? And the Saviour declares, "It is the Spirit that quickens. The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

As in the natural world a child cannot be said to be born of his father, until he is first born of his mother; so in the spiritual world, no one can be said to be born of the Spirit, until he has first been born of water.

What, then, shall we think of the conduct of those teachers, who, imagining that because an infant is born of Episcopalian or Presbyterian *flesh*, it is entitled to the privileges of that covenant under which

all, from the least to the greatest, were to know the Lord—presume to sprinkle it in the name of God, and declare that it is born again?

What shall we say of those who profess to believe, and actually persuade their hearers, *that a child can be born before it has been be gotten?*

And what degree of respect shall they claim from us, who hold forth, like Fuller, that the child of God *must be born before it can be begotten?*

DISCIPULUS.

*From the Religious Herald.*

## CREEDS AND CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

Mr. Editor,

HAVING seen several articles in your paper on "Creeds and Confessions of Faith," I send you for insertion an extract which I have been permitted to take from a sermon of Rev. Mr. *Howell*, preached in the church in Cumberland street, a few weeks since, from Jude v. 3. as containing, on this subject, the views of

A SUBSCRIBER.

IN the early ages of the church a party predominated, which has been since denominated by the appellation of Popery. The pride of numbers, and the arrogance of wealth and power, led them into the absurdity of setting themselves up as an authority to dictate to the world what they *should* and what they *should not* believe. Secessions from Popery have since claimed the same right; and at last, what originated in corruption and led millions into hypocrisy, has become fashionable in every denomination. Now "Creeds and Confessions of Faith" are almost as numerous as parties themselves. In the greater part of these instruments the most opposite and contradictory opinions are fearlessly asserted and perseveringly maintained—opinions as derogatory to truth as they are dishonorable to the judgment of their authors; and yet the partizans of each one of those systems defend it with the utmost zeal and pertinacity, as being, beyond doubt, "the faith which was once delivered to the saints."

For none of these, however, can we, with any propriety, "contend;" because they are as certainly false as they are contradictory. The Bible reveals but one system of truth. We do not say to embody this in the form referred to is impossible. Instances may have occurred in which this has been done; but that they are exceedingly rare, no one who is informed on the subject, can doubt for a moment. The nature of the case requires of us righteous judgment in this matter in a more eminent degree than in any other. With this truth all those who compile systems of faith profess to be deeply penetrated; and, accordingly we are informed of each of these "Creeds and Confessions," that "it embodies the substance of the word of God."

The amount, however, of falsehood and human innovation which abounds in them generally, is equal to their difference one from an-

other, added to the difference of the whole from the word of revelation. To *contend*, then, my brethren, for "Creeds and Confessions." is one thing; and to "contend for the faith" of Jesus Christ, as originally delivered, is another; and but too often they are antipodes of each other.

But the question is again asked, What do you conceive to be the faith referred to in the text? We reply, The Bible contans it—the Bible "without note or comment." Not the Bible as some take upon themselves to interpret it; for there are many professing to be ministers of Christ who wrap up the word in much critical acumen; so force the meaning even of its plainest passages, and so overwhelm its simplicity with distinctions and subdistinctions, with technichalities and spiritualities, that they make it speak almost any thing else than "the faith which was once delivered to the saints."

Are the scriptures perverted in their interpretation, then? we are asked; and if so, why are they perverted? That they are, none will doubt for a moment; it is therefore unnecessary to go into an argument to prove a position which is self-evident. We will content ourselves with pointing out the causes of this result, so devoutly deprecated by all who love the Lord Jesus Christ.

These causes are principally two: First, a cringing carnal disposition; and secondly, interested motives.

Carnal influence has introduced conciliating doctrines, which will appear well on the lips of him who prophesies smoothly, and which will not expose him to the rebukes of the fashionable professor. Here, too, we find the origin of "decent ordinances," splendid trappings, and that routine of ceremony which affects the head of sinners, but which leaves the heart as before—"*desperately wicked above all things.*"

Interested motives maintain all this. Hence denomination after denomination arises, modelled to suit the depraved views of men, and the prejudices of the age, with little or no regard to the word of God. Such denominations must have consequence, and support the titles of piety and wisdom; andthe next thing we see are "Creeds and Confessions of Faith," abundantly supported by scripture quotations, voluminous expositions, and defences. Thus again and again, are given to "airy nothing a local habitation and a name." If an advocate for truth dare expose the absurdity or inconsistency of opinions thus originated, immediately, as on another occasion, the cry resounds from every quarter, "*Great is Diana of the Ephesians!*"—Yes, this modern idol the foolish and ignorant are taught to believe certainly "fell down from Jupiter," and contains the essence of "the faith once delivered to the saints." But, my brethren, the secret of all this was exposed by Paul long since—"*By this craft they have their wealth.*" But there is also another secret involved in this business, which we will expose in its proper place. HONOR—FAME—POPULAR APPLAUSE—

> ——————"*What heart of man*
> *Is proof against thy sweet seducing charms?*"

## THE TESTIMONY OF A METHODIST BROTHER.

*To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.*

I FIND your old side folk as fond of declamation and vituperation as ours. They both have much to fear, and much to conceal. Their hostility to investigation may be attributed to ignorance in some instances—to *self-interest* in others. Some, it may be, do not tolerate reform because it comes in competition with their prepossessions. Ignorance, however, is generally the mother of Prejudice. "Like priest, like people," is a very appropriate adage for these days of degeneracy.

I do most ardently wish that you could accomplish a revolution in the creed-making world. The miserable flummery which now fills the confessions of faith, and poisons the spirits of millions in christendom, should be combatted by all the weapons of truth; and the fire should never cease until their dark colors were struck. For my own part, I am settled in these positions:—Whosoever walks by the New Testament standard, has no need for the puny auxiliary of a human creed: whoso follows the dictates of a human creed, cannot easily obey the mandates of the New Testament. There is as much *craft* (call it "priestcraft," or what you please) in the arrogant and unscriptural assumption of creed-making power, as in the pretended infallibility of His Holiness in the chair of St. Peter. My soul loathes all such assumptions. Point christians to the New Testament, and ask for the proof, from that holy book, of any delegation of Heaven's high prerogatives to priests and orthodox believers to make and impose on human consciences whatsoever system of doctrines, and course of practice, they, in the plenitude of their superior intelligence, may consider best for the government of the ignorant multitude. The very circumstance that creed-mongers are always at war with each other, and that some of the most bloody civil wars have been generated by their conflicting speculations on scripture doctrines; and that they have produced as many different systems of orthodoxy, as they have entertained opinions, renders their inspiration very suspicious, and their work nugatory in the estimation of all candid, thinking men.

I am aware that your antagonists will repeat that *creeds* are necessary to the peace of Zion. And so, may you reply, is Mahometanism. Who, that has ever read a church history, will say that creeds have not done infinitely more mischief than they have counteracted or prevented?

You have often adverted to this subject in your periodical, the *Christian Baptist;* but if you would introduce an effectual and thorough reformation, you must persevere in this essential point. Let men be convinced that their own works are imperfect, and they will be the more easily persuaded that the work of God is perfect, without their intermeddling to give it a finishing touch. On this subject you may hear again from your friend,

A RADICAL.

## HISTORY OF SIN,

INCLUDING THE OUTLINES OF ANCIENT HISTORY.—NO. III.

### *ASSYRIA.*

THE Assyrian empire, in its utmost extent, embracing Nineveh and Babylon, is the subject of the present lecture. Nineveh was founded by Ashur, who had the honor of giving name to this first of empires, and it was called Nineveh, after Ninus, his son and successor. Babylon was founded by Nimrod, and the commencement of this great city was the tower of Babel. Both Ashur and Nimrod were nobly born. Ashur was the second son of Shem, and Nimrod the eldest son of Chush, the son of Ham. Of their maternal ancestry we have no information.

The Assyrian history may be divided into the following periods:—

1. From the respective foundations of Nineveh and Babylon, which, probably, were laid about a century and a half after the Deluge, (say in the year 2198 before Christ, although the exact time cannot be ascertained,) till the subjection of Babylon to Nineveh, by Ninus, in the year 1758 before Christ, including a period of 440 years.

2. From the subjection of Babylon to Nineveh, A. C. 1758, to the death of Sardanapalus, and the revolt of Media and Babylon; or the dismemberment of the Assyrian empire, A. C. 770, including ten centuries.

3. From the dismemberment of the empire, when Arbaces took Media, Pul, or Ninus the younger, took Nineveh, and Belesis took Babylon, A. C. 770, until the conquest of Babylon by Essarhaddon, A. C. 680, including a period of 91 years.

4. From the union of Nineveh and Babylon, in 680, until the final destruction of Nineveh, under Saracus, by the Medes, in the year before Christ 606, containing 74 years.

5. From the fall of Nineveh, 606, to the fall of Babylon, A. C. 538, when taken by Cyrus. A period of 68 years.

The first period of the Assyrian history presents few incidents. Two great cities rose soon after the Deluge, nearly equal in opulence and power. Nimrod, the founder of Babylon, attempted to usurp the government of the world. The Jewish Targum says, "Nimrod began to be a mighty man in sin, a murderer of innocent men, and a rebel before the Lord." The Jerusalem Targum saith, "He was mighty in hunting and in sin, before God; for he was a hunter of the children of men." The Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzzel saith, "From the foundation of the world, none ever was found like Nimrod, powerful in hunting, and rebellious against the Lord." The Septuagint calls him a surly, or dog-like giant; the Arabic, a terrible tyrant; the Syriac calls him a warlike giant.

Ninus was equally ambitious, and, probably, more prudent—of course, more successful in the institution he founded, than Nimrod. I shall, however, not pursue the splendid detail of victories and conquests usually ascribed to Ninus, and especially Semiramis, his queen and successor. Some ancient writers relate, that Ninus, after having subjugated all the nations of Western Asia, left his empire to the sole management of his Queen, Semiramis, who extended her conquests through India, and nearly to the Pacific Ocean; that she adorned her capital with many illustrious monuments of her powerful and fortunate reign, and, at length, left her dominions to her son Ninyas. These events stand on nearly the same footing with those related of Sesostris, and, admitting they have any foundation, great allowance must be made for exaggeration. The great and pervading mind of Sir Isaac Newton thought them little worthy of notice. And it is the general opinion of the best informed, that clear historical light extends not far beyond the era of Nabonassar. Another important era commenced within five years after that: the year of the building of Rome was A. C. 752, the era of Nabonassar, A. C. 757—they corroborate each other.

When the family of Noah began to increase, after the Deluge, the descendants of Ham associating, formed the germ of a lasting and powerful institution. On the plains of Shinar they began to build a tower of amazing and stupendous strength and loftiness.

By some means the family of Ham kept possession of the tower and plain, which, from the confusion that had taken place, was called Babel, and the city where it stood Babylon. The precise places where the three sons of Noah settled are not known. It is generally thought that Noah himself removed eastward. Ashur, the second son of Shem, removed north-eastward from Babylon, and built Nineveh on the east side of the river Tigris, 150 miles from Babylon. This city, in wealth, power, and magnificence, was little inferior to Babylon, and often took its turn to reign over that proud city.

The fate of these cities, as well as the condition of the country round them, is unknown for the space of 1000 years. The loss of the library of Alexandria, noticed in the preceding lecture, probably buried these ages in darkness. Yet to husband our scanty materials in the best manner possible, I have noticed the opinion of some ancient authors, who affirm that about 440 years after the building of Babylon, it was conquered by the king of Nineveh, and became subject to the Assyrian empire in the year 1758 before Christ. And, sterile as it may appear, this completes our first period of the Assyrian history.

Second period, 988 years. Whether this empire remained unshaken during ten centuries that follow, we cannot pronounce. Various writers, however, contend that it did, and they give a continued list of the successive reigns. The land of Shinar, where Babylon stood, was, in the days of Abraham, governed by a king called Amraphel. The whole account given in sacred history of this prince makes him more resemble the chieftain of a banditti than the ruler of a great empire. Yet this was in the period now in question. The conquest of Asia by Sesostris was also about this time. He must have subdued both Babylon and Nineveh, if any such cities existed in his time.

Near the close of the period under consideration, Sardanapalus is monarch of the Assyrian empire, which, in his day, comprehended both Media and Babylon. He reigned at Nineveh, but was totally lost in voluptuous indolence and vicious amusement. Media, then rising to empire, contained a brave and warlike people; and Babylon, being impatient of the tyranny of a monarch so inactive and feeble, they both revolted, and at one time lifted the standard of rebellion. Arbaces, governor of Media, appears to have conducted this revolution, which was to dismember and break down the Assyrian empire. Arbaces was one of those great characters which have distinguished the rise and aggrandizement of every nation.

Sardanapalus, supinely wrapt in ease and pleasure, neither foresaw the gathering storm, nor was able to find a shelter from its utmost fury. He was crushed, not without great efforts, however, to prolong a life of infamy; and on the stage which he forsook, three men, of distinguished eminence in history, appeared. Belesis, a Chaldean priest, whose counsels and active services had raised him high in the esteem of Arbaces, obtained the government of Babylon, and Pul, who in his subsequent life showed himself capable of empire, obtained the government of Nineveh.

Babylon, however, and Nineveh, appear to have been designed by the strong and projecting genius of Arbaces, but as viceroyalties, dependant on his pleasure; although he allowed their respective governors to assume the title of king. The events which frustrated this purpose of Arbaces, and, in the end, clothed the governors of Nineveh and Babylon with absolute dominion, were they known, could not obtain a place in this lecture.

Third period, 91 years. We are now to contemplate the Assyrian monarchy in a definite form; and, as Sir Isaac Newton contends, in its first form. Arbaces, who had become a powerful monarch in Media, seems to have been sufficiently occupied in concerns which drew his attention from Mesopotamia; and both Babylon and Nineveh were left to establish their own independence.

Belesis, the governor or king of Babylon, is the same as Nabonassar, the founder of the famous chronological era which bears this name.

Nabonassar evinced no less ability in directing the affairs of his kingdom than in matters of useful science. In the few wars which he carried on he was generally prosperous, and the affairs of Babylon, long depressed by the jealous tyranny of a haughty rival and mistress, now wore a flourishing aspect. Nabonassar reigned 12 years, and was succeeded by his son Merodach-Baladan. This is the Chaldean monarch who sent an embassy to congratulate Hezekian, king of Judah, on the recovery of his health.

The length of the reign of this prince is not known, nor have any of the events of his administration escaped oblivion. There is still less known of his successors; nor are we now far distant from the time that Babylon is again united to the empire of Nineveh, or, as it is often called, the first Assyrian empire. Let us return to the history of that city.

Of the kings of Nineveh, after the dismemberment of the empire of Sardanapalus, very different accounts are given. Rollin considers Pul, whom I have just mentioned as concerned with Arbaces and Belesis, in the dismemberment of the empire, as the father and predecessor of Sardanapalus. I have followed, in this respect, the arrangement of Assyrian history in Rees' Cyclopœdia. Other writers insist that Nabonassar was not the same as Belesis, but was the son of Tiglath-pileser, one of the successors of Pul.

Having succeeded in the overthrow of Sardanapalus, and dismemberment of his empire, Pul marched westward, and carrying victory wherever he went, spread far and wide the terror of his arms. He invaded Menehem, king of Israel, in the second year of his reign, and would at that time have completed the conquest of the ten tribes, but he was prevailed upon to retire by a present of a thousand talents of silver. He did not retire, however, until he had promised them his alliance and protection; which promise, in the mouth of a great conqueror, is worse than the deadliest threat.

Pul, after having subjugated several nations in Syria and Palestine, returned to Nineveh in triumph, and was, in the opinion of Sir Isaac Newton, and several other writers, the real founder of the Assyrian empire. Yet the authority of Bedford, Shuckford, and Prideaux, in matters of this nature, must certainly be preferred to his, whom I consider as a better astronomer than chronologer. Prideaux affirms that the Assyrian empire had existed 1300 years before the reign of Sardanapalus.

Pul was succeeded by Tiglath-pileser, his eldest son, in Nineveh. The Assyrians of Nineveh were now formidable in all the west of Asia, in Syria, Palestine, and the countries west of the Euphrates. Tiglath-pileser conquered Damascus, and carried away the Syrians into captivity. This transportation of the inhabitants of conquered countries seems to have been a peculiar trait in the policy of the Assyrian monarchs. By the kings of Babylon and Nineveh, most of the inhabitants of Palestine, first and last, were either slain or carried into captivity. Tiglath-pileser, after a reign of 16 years, was succeeded by Shalmeneser. The only enterprize of this prince with which we are acquainted, is his invasion of Phenicia, and subversion of the kingdom of Israel. He made a progress through these countries with an overwhelming force. He laid siege to the city of Samaria; but here he met with considerable resistance. Hoshea, was then on the throne of Israel, had withdrawn his allegiance from the Assyrians, and had made application to So, or Sabaeus, king of Ethiopia, for aid. The Assyrian monarch, determined on ample vengeance, after wasting all the open country, laid siege to Samaria, a fortress of great strength. It cost him the labor of three years to reduce it; but at length, worn out by fatigues, and depressed by famine, this powerful and populous city fell before the conqueror. The king of Israel was loaded with chains, in which condition the stern tyrant caused him to pass the remainder of his days. The people of the ten tribes, as many as could be discovered and collected together, were sent into the remote regions of Media, whence they never returned.

The subversion of the kingdom of Israel took place about 250 years after

their revolt from the house of David, under Jeroboam, the son of Nebat.—During this long period, they had been sunk deep in idolatry and all the vices prevalent in the nations by which they were surrounded. They afford a striking instance how lost a nation may be to all sense of its true interest. Moses, their great legislator, had told them what to expect as the consequence of such a course. They were warned by many prophets. They were reproved by the voice, and by the hand of Providence. As they pursued the footsteps of the heathen nations, they were subjected to their calamities, and given up to desolation and ruin. Whether they, like the Jews, still exist as a nation, has been the subject of various inquiries. The sanguine feelings of projecting theorists have enabled them to discover this long lost nation among the Tartars, the Turks, the Indians, and other nations. It is doubtful whether they ever appear. The probability is, that they blended with those Asiatic tribes among which they lived. Their propensity to this, even before their dispersion, was too great to be restrained.

Shalmaneser was succeeded in the Assyrian throne by Sennacherib, his son, A. C. 719. Little is known of the life and actions of this prince but what is derived from the sacred scriptures.

Sennacherib was succeeded in his throne by his son Essarhaddon, in whose reign the empire of the Assyrians of Nineveh appears to have gained its utmost height. All the neighboring nations seem to have fallen under the power of these ambitious, haughty, and warlike princes. Even Media and Babylon, which after the fall of Sardanapalus rose into independent states, were again reduced and re-annexed to the empire of Nineveh; and, indeed, all the nations of Western Asia, and also of Africa, as far as worthy the ambition of a conqueror, fell under this extensive dominion.

And it is now, in all probability, that the city of Nineveh appeared in its utmost splendor. For the wars and conquests of these despotic and cruel tyrants were wars of extermination. They had no regard to the claims of humanity and mercy. They seemed, indeed, utterly lost to all human feelings. They were not moved by the cries of millions, neither had age nor infancy, nor the tears of beauty, nor the charms of virtue, any influence on their adamantine hearts. They seized, they plundered, they slew and laid waste wherever they came; and the wealth of nations was swept and heaped together to gratify the pride and luxury of one.

We have no particular account of the actions of Essarhaddon. In the year 668 before Christ he was succeeded by Saosduchinus, and he by Chyniladon. Nabopolassar, the general of the armies of his prince, revolted from him, and erected Baoylon into an independent kingdom. The kings of Nineveh, after Essarhaddon, rapidly declined; and as the best details of the reigns of these kings is not to be relied on, presenting, indeed, little better than a scene of confusion and uncertainty, we shall hasten to the catastrophe of Nineveh. Chyniladon was succeeded by Sarac, the last of the kings of Nineveh.

Babylon and Media had once before conquered Nineveh; but the final hour of retribution, for this ancient and abandoned metropolis, was now approaching. Cyaxeres, king of the Medes, and Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who had lately succeeded his father Nabopolasser, now combined their forces and invaded Nineveh. The siege terminated in the reduction of the city; Sarac was slain, and an end was put to this cruel, voluptuous, and very ancient people, A. C. 606—74 years from the conquest of Babylon by Essarhaddon, and 165 years from the accession of Pul to the throne of Nineveh.

There can be no question that Nineveh was one of the largest cities of ancient times. When Jonah was sent to prophesy against it, the scriptures declared it to contain six score thousand persons who could not discern their right hand from their left, meaning children in, and near, infancy. What city in Europe contains 120,000 infants? Nineveh must then have contained nearly a million of people. But the prophecy of Jonah is supposed to have been some time before the reign of Sardanapalus. It was far more opulent and powerful in the last dynasty of its princes. Thus perished the first Assyrian empire. [*Whelpley's Lectures.*]

## HISTORICAL SKETCH.

*Baptists.*—THIS denomination is distinguished from others by their opinions respecting the mode and subjects of baptism. They administer baptism only by immersion: and to none but adults. They claim an immediate descent from the Apostles, and assert that the constitution of their churches is derived immediately from Jesus Christ. Others affirm that they had their origin at a much later day, even as late as the 16th century. The following are the principal sects of Baptists:—1. Particular Baptists of England and Wales; 2. General Baptists of England and Wales; 3. Mennonites of Holland and other countries; 4. the Scotch, or Weekly Communion Baptists; 5. Associated or Calvinistic Baptists of the United States; 6. Seventh Day Baptists; 7. Six Principle Baptists; 8. Mennonites of America; 9. Tunker Baptists; 10. Free Will Baptists; 11. Christian Society; 12. Emancipators; 13. Free Communion Baptists.

*Associated, or Calvinistic Baptists of America.*—This is the largest body of Baptists in the world, in point of numbers and influence. It is stated that the additions to their churches, during the last year, amounted to a greater number than the whole of Baptist denominations in England and Ireland. Their oldest church in this country is that called the First in Providence, formed in 1639. The first Association was formed at Philadelphia in 1707. Total number of communicants, 304,827.

*Seventh Day Baptists.*—They differ from the Baptists generally, in no respect, except in regard to the Sabbath, believing that the *seventh*, and not the *first* day of the week, is the day which ought to be religiously observed. In 1668, there were a few churches of this connexion in England. The first Sabbatarian Church in America was formed in Newport, R. I. in 1671. They are confined principally to that state. A few years since they numbered about 1000 communicants. In the United States there are about 2000 members united together in an Annual Conference. Population, 10,000.

*Six Principle Baptists.*—So called from their belief that the custom recognized in Hebrews vi. 1, 2, of the imposition of hands, is still binding as a prerequisite to church communion. As these two verses contain *six* distinct propositions, these Baptists have acquired the name of Six Principle Baptists, to distinguish them from others, sometimes Five Principle. They reside mostly in Rhode Island and New York, and in 1828 consisted of about 20 churches, and from 1, 00 to 1,800 members.

*Mennonites.*—So called from Menno, a distinguished member of the sect. They are said to be descendants of the Waldenses. They are a simple, harmless people, and make it an article of their faith never to bear arms. In the latter part of the 17th century they settled in Pennsylvania. According to Benedict, there were, in 1824, 200 Mennonite churches in America.

*Tunkers.*—They have acquired this name from the manner in which they perform the rite of baptism, the word *Tunker* being a corruption of *Tumbler*. They first appeared in America in 1719. They hold the doctrine of universal salvation, with some peculiar

qualifications. They have probably 40 or 50 churches, principally in the Western States.

*Free Will Baptists.*—The first church of this sect was gathered in New Durham, New Hampshire, in 1780, by Benjamin Randall. They soon after received considerable additions from those "who saw the beauties of a *free salvation.*" In 1783 they held a general Meeting at Phippsburg, Maine; at which time they agreed to hold a similar meeting four times a year. The number of ministers probably amounts to 300; churches, 370; communicants, 16,000.

*Christian Society.*—In defence of the name which they have assumed, they quote Acts xi. 26. xxvi. 28. 1 Peter iv. 16. regarding all others as the invention of men. They baptize only by immersion. The first society of this kind was formed in Portsmouth, N. H. in 1803. They have spread extensively in all parts of the United States. They are anti-calvinistic, and anti-trinitarian. They profess to receive the scriptures as the only rule of faith and practice. They have not far from 1000 congregations.

*Emancipators.*—In 1805 a number of ministers and churches in Kentucky took a decided stand against slavery, in principle and practice. In no other respect do they differ from the Calvinistic Baptists. Their number is constantly increasing.

*Free Communion Baptists.*—This name is given to about 30 ministers and churches, who reside west of Albany, in the state of New York. Except on the subject of communion, they do not differ from other Baptists.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF BAPTISTS.

| *Names.* | *No. of Ministers.* | *No. of Communicants.* |
|---|---|---|
| Calvinistic, | 2,914 | 304,827 |
| Seventh Day, | 30 | 3,000 |
| Six Principle, | 25 | 1,700 |
| Mennonites, | 250 | 30,000 |
| Tunkers, | 40 | 3,000 |
| Free Will, | 300 | 16,000 |
| Christians, | 300 | 30,000 |
| Emancipators, | 10 | 400 |
| Free Communion, | 30 | 3,500 |
| Total, | 3,899 | 392,427 |

[*Quarterly Register & Journal.*

## DECEIVING AND BEING DECEIVED.

THE following was published in England for the use of the English Christians. On such a representation, what good Englishman will not contribute? ED. M. H.

*To the friends of Christianity in England and Scotland.*

THE Board of Directors for the *Western Theological Seminary* in the United States, by their Agent, the Rev. *A. D. Campbell*, would beg leave to call your attention to a brief statement of the moral condition and wants of that part of the world where Divine Providence has cast our lot.

The great valley of the Mississippi, and its tributary streams, where we live, spreads over a surface containing more than 1,800,000 square miles. Here there is, at the present time, a scattered population, rapidly increasing, amounting to more than four millions.

What is to be the moral and religious condition of this great multitude, is a consideration well deserving the serious attention of the friends of religion and human happiness in every part of the world. Firmly persuaded that where there is no vision the people perish, the friends of the Redeemer in this Western Region are making an effort to erect and endow a *Theological Seminary* for the education of pious young men, on such a plan, and to such an extent, that a competent supply of well educated ministers may go forth and labor in this great, but as yet little cultivated, vineyard of the Son of God.

The plan, constitution, and contemplated course of instruction, (of which our Agent can furnish all the details,) are upon the most liberal principles. Its theological views are in entire accordance with the Assembly's Catechism, and Westminster Confession of Faith.

We are urged to this great undertaking by the fact, that more than four-fifths of the inhabitants in this Western World are living without the benefits of a regular ministry; and at the present time there are more than a thousand organized churches here which have no stated ministry, and a much larger number could soon be formed had we men of competent education, and a right missionary spirit, to send forth.

To save this rising country from the miseries of infidelity or superstition, or both combined, is the sole object of this Seminary, which has been placed under the direction and patronage of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

But, beloved friends, our resources are few, and our means limited; our people are yet comparatively poor, and therefore it is we have sent our Agent to ask aid of a people from whom we boast we have descended, and whose pious and benevolent exertions are now filling the Christian world with delight and thanksgiving. Brethren in Christ, we earnestly solicit your aid in this arduous undertaking. We send unto you the Macedonian cry, "Help us!" pity the multitudes dwelling in our vast forests, who have none to bring them the glad tidings of the gospel.

Your donations to this Institution shall be sacredly devoted in the manner, and to the objects, you may specify; your names enrolled on its records among its benefactors; whilst the prayers of thousands in this distant land will be continually offered up in behalf of those by whose instrumentality they have received the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Signed by order of the Board of Directors of the Western Theological Seminary. FRANCIS HERRON, D. D. *President.*

*Pittsburg*, March 25, 1829. E. P. SWIFT, *Secretary.*

P. S. Donations of theological or scientific books will be thankfully received. It is requested that the donors will write their names in the title pages of the books they may be pleased to bestow.

## CHRISTIANOS TO THE EDITOR OF THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

*Dear Sir*,

I ASK room (which I have no doubt you will grant me) for some remarks, in reply to your strictures in the last "Harbinger" (No. 3.) on Christianos and the eighth chapter of Romans."

On the *spirit* or the *manner* in which your introductory paragraphs are written, I shall have room to say but little; nor is it to be regretted; inasmuch as it does not appear, in the present case, that your exordium requires much attention.

You have dealt out a little *acid* for the benefit of my *nervous feelings*; but I doubt, my good sir, it will not have the *desired effect*:—as far as I can judge, the *preparation* will not much affect my system—either beneficially or injuriously. Nor do I think it will prove very palatable to others, except to a few, here and there, whose taste, I will not allow myself to believe, you would feel pleased in gratifying.—For *them*, indeed, it will not be strong enough: there ought to be more of the *acid*, and even a little *gall*. In the mean time, as to this *jeu d'esprit*, in your strictures on "Christianos," I do not forget that a man who is amply gifted with any peculiar species of talent, is liable to peculiar temptation to misuse it; and in no case, perhaps, is he more so, than in the case of talent for satire. And the force of the temptation, I am willing to allow (according to a sentiment you have advanced in an excellent Essay on "Sin") may be offered as some extenuation of the actual fault.

In regard to the little publication, headed "Take Heed!"—it appears to me, upon a review of the piece, that it might have been so modelled, that while the points there intended to be guarded, were expressed in their full force, it might have come forth in the form of a *caution*—answering more appropriately to its title, "Take Heed"—and in this form might have been better adapted to answer the desired end, without affording any apparent ground of complaint. Thus far I cheerfully concede; and to any *circumtantial* modification, for the sake of good feeling, I hope never to be opposed.

Permit me now to correct one or two mistakes into which you have fallen:—

1. I was not at the Bowling Green, on the occasion you have mentioned, but some 16 or 18 miles from that place, at my own appointment. Had I been there, it is not probable I should have concealed myself from your view. So then, "the fit was" *not* "brought on" by hearing that lecture. "This, however, is an unimportant circumstance." I was informed of your exposition of the passage alluded to, Rom. viii. 26. by several intelligent persons, who concurred with each other in the account which they gave. But,

2. It is not quite correct to say, that your exposition of his verse was "the cause" of what you are pleased to term "this fit"—"this prodigious alarm." If you will give yourself the trouble to inspect the little publication of Christianos," you will see that this exposi-

tion is introduced only as an auxiliary evidence; and is particularly specified, as a remarakble instance, concurring with other indications, and strongly symptomatic of the fact, that "there are attempts in progress to banish from amongst us the persuasion of a divine operation," &c. And allowing me to speak according to my own views of divine influence, can it be said there was any thing illiberal in such a construction? We who consider your interpretation of this particular passage as seriously erroneous, are represented by you, as maintaining the contrary interpretation "to aid a system." . Now, after all that you have said ☞and *not* said, on the subject of divine influence;—after the strong apprehensions which have thus been produced, among many, as to your sentiments on that point;—to find you, under these circumstances, giving so singular a construction to this 26th verse of the 8th Romans,—a construction going to annihilate all evidence to be drawn from that passage; I must leave it to the candid to judge, whether there was not apparent ground to believe that *you* were influenced, in this construction, by a desire "to aid a system," or, if you like it better, to countenance your own view of a particular point in question. I hope, my dear sir, you will not complain; you have, in this very case, thus judged of us. At the same time I readily allow, that a preconceived system too often has an unhappy influence on all our minds—and should be cautiously guarded against, in our constructions and interpretations. But surely, I am not to renounce a truth (or what appears to me to be a truth) because it may have constituted one of the links in the chain of a system-maker.

It is time to come nearer to the point at issue—the interpretation of the 26th verse of the 8th Romans: and towards this point I shall now approach; though, in doing so, and venturing to meet you here, I may, with some, incur the charge of having gone over from one extreme to another, and from the "timorous," have become the *temerarious* "Christianos." Be it observed, however, my dear sir, that I do not pretend to vie with you in talents or learning; though you are pleased to bestow upon me a sort of *left-handed* compliment, by referring the hints you have offered, to the decision of my "superior judgment." No, sir; it would ill become one who has no claim to any thing like gigantic *natural talents*—and whose whole opportunity for *scholastic education* was limited by a term of eight months;—it would ill become such a one, to vie with you in that way. And (indulge me, I beseech you, a little longer) the general mass of those who are best acquainted with me, will, I am persuaded, do me the justice to testify, that the tenor of my way has not been marked with arrogant claims of this sort, nor of any other. There may be some two or three individuals who would speak differently; but you know how to make allowance for prejudice and misconception. I have failings enough, without this.

You and your readers will pardon this egotism: the occasion must be my apology; and I will proceed;—just premising, that the question

of divine influence (as you know) does not rest on this particular passage of scripture—only that I consider it, among others, as an interesting evidence.

We shall quote (if you please) from the translation which you have published. Rom. viii. 26. "And likewise, even the Spirit helpeth our infirmities: for what we should pray for as we ought, we do not know; but the Spirit himself intercedeth for us by inarticulate groanings." Verse 27. "And he who searcheth the hearts, knoweth what the mind of the Spirit, is, that to God he intercedeth for the saints."

Now, your own method for ascertaining the true meaning of scripture, is, "*to follow common sense, and to read it, subject to the ordinary rules of interpretation.*" (See letter to R. B. Semple.) To this method, as far as it goes, I assent. Well, sir, my first remark is this general one:—That a plain reader, with this passage before him, taken in its connexion;—conscientiously seeking for truth, and following the rules of interpretation you have recommended;—would be very apt to consider *the Spirit of God* as being here referred to. Such is my persuasion; and as far as it may commend itself to the judgment and experience of others, so far it will have the weight to which it is entitled. I shall enter into particulars, by paying attention to the "hints" which you have suggested.

1. "There is no adjunct or epithet (you say) attached to the term *spirit*, in the 26th verse, which would authorize the conclusion that the Spirit of God is referred to."

Indeed, sir, I must differ from you. Let us see how this matter stands. This whole chapter abounds, we may remark, with references to the Spirit of God;—and in regard, not to his miraculous, but his sanctifying influence. Some times that Divine Agent is directly and plainly named; but more frequently he is obviously referred to, in connexion with our own spirits, or, with the principle and temper of holiness wrought in the heart. In verse 16, the Apostle having occasion to introduce distinctly, though in conjunction, the Divine Spirit and our own spirits, uses there the emphatical "adjunct" *himself* or *itself*, to designate the former: "Also the Spirit *itself* (*Auto to pneuma*) beareth witness together with *our* spirit, that we are the children of God." The *manner* in which the Spirit bears witness, is not the question. In the progress of his discourse (v. 26) the Apostle comes to assign another office, or (if you please) another sort of operation to the Spirit; namely, the help given to our infirmities; and having designated the Divine Agent as above, the same phrase here occurs—the same emphatical adjunct is here used: "And likewise, even the Spirit helpeth our infirmities: for what we should pray for as we ought, we do not know; but the Spirit himself (*Auto to pneuma*) intercedeth for us by inarticulate groaning." Now, the emphatical adjunct, *itself* or *himself*, being used obviously, in the first instance, to distinguish the Spirit of God, and the same adjunct applied shortly afterwards;—add to this, that the whole chapter abounds with references to the Holy Spirit, in his gracious operations;—all this con-

sidered, I shall leave it to all candid readers to judge whether your first hint is not satisfactorily answered.

2. You say that, "to represent the Spirit of God as interceding for the saints, is incompatible with any office or work assigned to the Spirit, in any passage in the Old or New Testament. He cannot (you add) furnish a sentence in all the volumes of revelation which looks like it."

Why, sir, I am endeavoring to make it appear, that this very sentence, under consideration, "looks like it"—very much like it: and I do think that I have already, in a great measure, succeeded. I must maintain, even from what has already been adduced, that this sentence does countenance the sentiment, that the Holy Spirit does, *in some sense*, "intercede for the saints." You cannot, therefore, as a logician, accuse me of begging the question.

3. Paul, in his context, (you remark) represents the Lord Jesus as interceding for us. QUERY—*Does the Holy Spirit and the Saviour sustain the same office?*

This hint is connected in its nature with the second; and having reserved some remarks for this place, I will here be a little more explicit. *The Holy Spirit and the Saviour—Do they sustain the same office?* I answer, no; not precisely; though the same term (you will surely agree) may be used to express the work of each. They do not *intercede* in the same way; nor should I think it suitable to designate the Holy Spirit, by way of eminence, as *the Advocate* or *Intercessor for sinners with God.* Jesus Christ is eminently our Advocate and Intercessor with the Father; as offering *directly* to God, on our behalf that plea which if founded on the sacrifice of himself. He is the Intercessor *without* us, at the throne of *glory.* The Holy Spirit makes intercession for us in a different way; namely, *through the medium of our own spirit*—by what John calls "an unction from the Holy One"—and by shedding forth (according to Zech. xii. 10.) "the spirit of grace and of supplication." He is an intercessor *within* us, at the throne of *grace.* But thus to make intercession *for* us—*in* us, is only one of his manifold operations; his graces are manifold, as well as his miraculous gifts.

4 "Why should the Spirit of God (you ask) use groans which cannot be expressed in words? Does this weakness belong to that Divine Agent?"

I must own, sir, that from you I should hardly have expected such an objection as this, to be thrown in the way. However, I am really pleased that it is brought forward. The expression, I am aware, may present a difficulty to the minds of some, and an opportunity is thus offered for its removal. This, I think, may easily be done, and in a few words. The Spirit of God (I should say) no more makes use (actually) of *words*, than of *groans:* yet we find our Lord telling his disciples, Matt. x. 20. in reference to the defence which they should be enabled to make before their persecutors—"It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." Now, my dear sir, I ask, is not this relevant to the point? and are not the two cases,

as far as any difficulty exists, analogous? To me they appear entirely so. Recur, then, if you please, to what was said a little while past. The Holy Spirit makes intercession for us *through the medium of our own spirit.* This Divine Agent is not here to be considered as abstracted from our spirits; but as in us, and influencing our hearts and minds. It is thus that he maketh intercession for us, and thus that he sometimes does it "with groanings which cannot be uttered."

Let me here add, that the very idea of an *intercessor* implies the interposition of a third person between two parties. Aware of this, you remind us, that "in all languages the body and the spirit are often personified and distinguished from each other." This, sir, is admitted: yet I cannot admit that this resort is necessary to a fair construction of the passage before us: and the interpretation, I must say, dressed out in this manner, seems to make a constrained appearance, and cuts, even from your hands (I speak seriously)—even from *your* hands, my dear sir, it cuts but an awkward figure.

[I wish I could condense more: I am reluctant to occupy so much room.]

5. "In some versions, in Thomson's, and in the King's translation, it reads, He or it makes intercession for the saints according to the will of God. Is it admissible to say that the Spirit of God, in this or any given case, makes intercession for the saints *according* to the will of God, or *according to God?* The Spirit of God, acting according to the will of God, in any one case, implies an incongruity, for which there is no analogy in the book of God." Such is your fifth objection—having reference to the 27th verse.

And am I fairly obliged, by any canon of interpretation or criticism, to make my exposition correspond with every translation, however they may vary from each other? Really, sir, it looks a little ungenerous to set such a task for the "timorous Christianos." I was willing, in this case, to quote from the translation which you have published, and recommended as the best: but here you refer me to two other versions, which differ a little from yours, and which you consider not so favorable to my view. *You* furnished the arms, my good sir:—don't throw down your sword and take another because it is longer. This does not seem fair.

However, I do not enter this complaint for the purpose of escaping from the difficulty. I am very willing to attend to what the King's translation says, and am pleased to find you thus recommending it. "He (the Spirit) maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." Here you ask, "Is it admissible to say, that the Spirit of God makes intercession for the saints according to the will of God?" Truly, sir, I must say, I think it is: for if the Divine Spirit cannot do this in us, what is there in us that can do it? But you add, "The Spirit of God acting according to the will of God, in any one case, implies an incongruity for which there is no analogy in the book of God." Well, sir, are you not wrong in this position? Review it, I beseech you, and then compare it with John xvi. 13. "Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he shall guide you into

all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak." Dr. Campbell's translation is precisely to the same effect. Now, sir, you said, "in any one case;" and I ask, is not this one case in point? Is not the Spirit of God here represented as acting "*according* to the will of God?" "He shall not speak of himself?" Why, nothing in the passage under consideration presents such a difficulty as this expression. "But whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." He shall speak, then, "*according* to the will of God." I do believe, sir, you will have the candor and liberality to acknowledge that in this position you were mistaken.

6. You add, "If I were to make this matter plain to a child, I would ask, what propriety in saying that these groans were examined in the heart and understood in the heart by God, if the Spirit of God uttered these groans himself?"

I trust, sir, that the remarks already offered may be considered as going far towards clearing up this difficulty. We do not consider the Spirit of God as uttering these groans in any other way than through the medium of our own spirit; or, if you please, in any other sense than as that Spirit was said (as before quoted) to speak in the Apostles. The circumstance that in the case of the Apostles there was a miraculous operation, does not affect the analogy, as far as the objection or difficulty is concerned. And then, as to the "propriety in saying that these groans ware examined in the heart and understood in the heart by God"—why, surely, if the Spirit searcheth and knoweth the things of God, as is said, 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11, it is perfectly allowable to say, that God knoweth the mind of the Spirit, thus making intercession in us.

Having already made so large a draft on your pages, I cannot now undertake to give, as you propose, "a connected view of the whole passage." This, perhaps, may be attempted in a future communication; but with no desire, I can solemnly say,—with no desire to enter the field of polemic strife.

In the mean time permit me to assure you, that while I have considered some points which you appear to me to maintain, as justly obnoxious to censure and condemnation, I have been all along willing to give you full credit for the able and admirable manner in which many topics, appertaining to the Christian Economy, have been handled in your different publications —That while I have considered, and must consider (allow me to speak plainly) that you have pushed some of your views to a dangerous extreme, I have been fully persuaded that you have been instrumental in giving an impulse to the christian public, which, under due regulation, might result in beneficial and happy consequences.—*A-propos!* The piece you have given us (in No. 3) from the "Vermont Telegraph," is, I think, well worthy of attention To guard against the dangerous extremes above hinted at, has been my object in several pieces which I have published. I never thought of even complaining against you (much less of *denouncing* you) merely because you differed from me *in the exposition of a text of scripture:* this would be monstrous though I *did* look on *that*

exposition (under existing circumstances) as a sort of *ecce signum!* a striking token, and a sign hung out to favor a particular view or sentiment. If I erred, forgive me.

In conclusion of this long communication, (bear with it for this one time) permit me further to assure you, that I entertain for you, personally, sentiments of high regard, and feelings of a friendly and affectionate character. Such were my sentiments and feelings while I addressed you under the guise of "PAULINUS;" such they have been while wearing the name of "CHRISTIANOS;" and such they are, while I appear *in propria persona*, and subscribe myself,

Yours, for Christ's sake,

AND'W. BROADDUS.

---

MATTHEWS COUNTY, May 4th, 1830.

*Brother Campbell:*

DEAR SIR—

TO my surprise, and not a little to my mortification, did I read my letter of March 8th in your last *Harbinger*. The loose manner in which several sentiments were expressed, and the peculiar position in which it placed me before the public, would, if I had known your rules, have caused me positively to forbid its publication. Young and inexperienced in the christian life, I did not suppose that my opinions would weigh much with any one; much less did I think of being brought before the public in opposition to a large proportion of the *gospel ministers* at the present day, many of them as respected for their talents, as for their zeal in establishing what they believe to be the Kingdom of the Messiah.

While presenting you with my list of queries, I took that opportunity to write what I thought would most interest you. I gave my opinion as freely, and related some facts as indifferently as though I had been in private conversation with you, not dreaming they would be seen by any one but yourself; indeed, so little did I think of it at the time, that I did not take a copy of the letter, as is my usual custom; and its contents had nearly slipped my memory, until they were revived by reading it in the Harbinger.

It is natural to the mind to seek its ease; to sink down into that state which will afford the greatest satisfaction, with the least exertion. It is a forced state when we find ourselves brought into collision with our fellow-beings, without at the same time anticipating a greater harvest than the toils and burden of the day have cost us. To what reward could I have looked—what inducement could I have had, thus to bring myself before the public as an accuser of a considerable part of the Clergy at the present day? Many with whom I am acquainted believe, conscientiously believe, in the doctrines preached by the brother referred to in the third paragraph of the letter. Though to me they appear as discordant as light and darkness—as irrational as that a mixture of snow and ice would produce the greatest possible

degree of heat; I say, though they appear thus to me, by viewing them through a different medium others may arrive at different conclusions. Those who are of the same opinion may freely express themselves to each other; but if we would gain an antagonist—if we would convince his understanding—we should keep clear of arousing his prejudice, and not begin by telling him he has lost his reason, if we really think so. Matter of opinion, we both admit, should be no ground of christian contention. Is it not wrong, then, to publish that, which, though it might harmlessly pass between ourselves, would probably have no other effect than to arouse those angry passions which too often infest the human breast? Did you enter on the begun controversy with brother Clopton in that spirit you would have done had he not used terms so harsh, and which were well calculated to alienate those finer feelings of the heart which christian charity should extend to a brother in the Lord, though he differed *toto cælo* with him in opinion—standing as you do in the christian world, watched with an eagle's eye by the popular Clergy of the day, followed in your every step with a vigilance that would have done credit to the fabled Argus—you have thus far been able to triumph in those principles which, having truth for their foundation, all the weapons of your adversaries have not only fallen harmless, but have been turned upon themselves.

Not long since I was in company with a number of brethren, when your controversy with brother Clopton became the subject of conversation. Your best friends would not sustain you in the spirit you manifested in your answer to his preface. They asked significantly if the same spirit which governed you in your answer to brother Semple, could have been uppermost when you answered brother Clopton? It was agreed on all hands that brother Clopton was as harsh and severe as he well could be, both on you and your writings; but they thought this no reason why you should retort in the sarcastic manner you did; that it would have been better for your cause not to have reviled again because you were reviled; that his comparing you with Saul of Tarsus, with the poet Byron, was no reason why you should compare him with the Scribes and Pharisees of old, or to one of Solomon's fools. You both profess to be actuated by your love to Christ: let us see which will imitate him the nearest, and show most of his spirit in this discussion.

When I retrospect the past year of my life, and see the goodness of the Lord in keeping me from the paths of error; when I view the narrow manner by which I escaped from being indissolubly wedded to a system which I am now fully convinced is not right, but the remains of popery, I feel under renewed obligations to my Heavenly Father, and raise my prayers and supplications to him with more confidence, to keep me from the paths of error, and to guide me into all truth. Many things you have advanced are *sub judice* with me as yet. It is a hard matter to wear off old impressions and ideas we have long been taught to believe as true. Of these the most important is the remission of sins by immersion. I cannot associate the one with the

other, though there are several places in the New Testament which seem to be positive on this point.

With your notes on the 8th of Romans I was much pleased. Following the populars of the day, I had always believed that the Spirit of God, and not man's, interceded before God with inarticulate groanings. How this was I could not tell. There seemed a discrepancy on the very face of it. But conceiving it to be above my powers of mind, I thought it best to call it *mystery*, and let it pass.

Had you known the author of *Christianos*, I think you would not have treated him so unceremoniously as you did. If I have been rightly informed, he is one for whom you entertain a high degree of respect.

I must now conclude this letter, having already much exceeded the limits I intended with my uncouth expressions, praying that our common Lord would bless you with health and strength, both of body and mind, to persevere in your endeavors to prostrate that Man of Sin, which we see has exalted himself over us in this our happy country, even from the Mother of Harlots down to the humblest creed.

Yours in the Lord, N.

*Bishop A. Campbell.*

## THE SUPPORT OF THE GOSPEL.

A correspondent in the *Columbian Star* recommends the following for the support of the gospel:—

*"What shall be done to remedy this great listlessness in the duty of supporting the gospel among the Baptist Churches?*

Answer 1. Let every editor of religious papers, (especially the editor of the Star & Index.) urge the duty with increasing vigilance from year to year, from month to month, and from week to week. The propriety of this is evident, when it is considered that he has the opportunity of presenting to his readers, the best matured arguments that can be offered on the subject, together with other good selections, without the danger of making personal enemies in the several congregations, or being charged with mercenary views, of which invidual preachers are in so much danger, and which they so much dread.

2. Let preachers promote, by every laudable means, the circulation of the Star & Index, pointing out to the deacons those arguments in particular which treat on this subject, and insinuate the propriety of their execution: and through the instrumentality of the paper, the deacons may imperceptibly introduce the noble practice of the support of the gospel, so that the present and following generations may not do as the former, but esteem it as binding a duty to pay their preacher as to pay their taxes.

3. Let the deacons in every church be industrious in stirring up the congregation, and in particular the members, to the important duty of paying their preachers. Let the point be argued and the reasons set before the members of the congreagation why they should pay their preacher. They will perhaps complain that they are poor and have no money to spare: but if the preacher can, *for their benefit*, devote ninety-six days in the year to the preaching of the gospel, could not each male member of his congregations work two days in the year for his support? Would it not be reasonable and just? Suppose he attended four congregations, and each yielded 100 male hearers, that is 400 male hearers. Suppose these should work two days each, at 37½ cents per day, that would be 300 dollars. And a like number of ladies paying 25 cents each, (which they could do without feeling it,) would be 400 dollars to the

preacher, which would be a good support to him, and would be felt by none who paid it. This would be doing much good to the cause of God, and a special act of justice to every minister of the gospel. Until some such practice is adopted by the Baptist denomination as the above, it may be expected that the ministry of that order, in general, will continue ignorant and superstitious: and instead of the gospel of Jesus Cerist, will preach their own dreams and imaginations for the want of better information. How can better be expected? "Who is going a warfare at his own expense?" Who can take the trouble of informing himself upon all the subjects connected with the gospel ministry, without the support of his brethren?"

## BAPTISM BY IMMERSION IN A CHURCH.

AN extraordinary occurrence took place in St. Martin's church on Tuesday last. A very amiable young lady, named *Prossor*, who was brought up a Dissenter from the Church of England, having attended for a considerable time at St. Martin's Church, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. *Richards*, was anxious to become a communicant with this church; but not having been christened, it was necessary she should previously undergo that ceremony. She, however, objected to the form of christening, viz. throwing or sprinkling water on the face, as contrary to the language of the gospel, as well as to the formula in the prayer-book, the former of which says, speaking of adults who were baptized by the Apostle, "And they straightway went down *into* the water and were baptized," &c. and the latter, speaking of infants, says, "And they shall warily dip them," &c. She therefore applied to Dr. Richards to be allowed at her christening that the ceremony might be performed according to what she conceived was the literal scriptural meaning of the words of the Apostle—by submersion. The Doctor, at first, said it was quite impossible, and attempted to convince the lady, by argument, that sprinkling was equally efficacious. The Doctor's argument only went to convince her that, if baptism were good for any thing at all, it was essential that the form adopted by the Saviour and the Apostles should be strictly adhered to. In this dilemma it was suggested that, upon an application being made to the Bishop of London, he might grant a dispensation to have the ceremony performed in the manner the lady desired it—by dipping. The application was made, and it was granted. Last Tuesday was appointed for the ceremony to take place; and about mid-day a large oblong wooden tub was placed close to the baptismal font in St. Martin's Church, and the lady made her appearance, suitably attired, with woollen under clothing. It was a bitter cold day, but the lady was nothing daunted, and the Doctor "warily dipped her" over head and ears, after reading the appropriate service. The lady afterwards retired to the vestry with her female friends, and having exchanged her wet apparel for dry clothes, returned home to her family in Charing Cross, where the health of the new Christian was drunk with due honors.

The only instance of baptism by immersion having taken place in one of our churches before, occurred at Leicester, and with the consent of the Bishop of the Diocess. [*London paper, Dec.* 1829.]

*Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Macon, Geo. to the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger, dated April, 1830.*

"CAMPBELLISM, it seems, from a harmless *sporadic*, exciting but little attention, has become an *epidemic* of fearful potency, setting at defiance the united skill of the most distinguished of the clerical faculty. As this disease (so interesting to the moral philosopher and pathologist) first appeared in your vicinity, you can probably furnish me with a brief sketch of its rise and progress, its characteristic features, and the best means of circumscribing its fatal influence; in doing which, you will lay me under peculiar obligation. Earnestly, sir, I would be gratified to see a synopsis of your theological system, that I may thereby learn wherein consists the discrepancy between yourself and those who denounce you as a schismatic and the propagator of damnable heresies. Your obedient servant,

"OCTOGANARY."

A MORE MINUTE HISTORY MAY YET BE GIVEN.

MY theological system is the Sacred Writings of the Apostles and Evangelistsof Jesus Christ. It is an old system; but because the Man of Sin, during the Great Apostacy, banished it from Christendom, it is now called a *new* system. This old thing, has, indeed, become new; and from an *endemic* in its influences, it is fast becoming an *epidemic*. All the Doctors of Divinity on the continent cannot stop its progress. It is now spreading with incredible rapidity over this country. All sexes, ages, and conditions are affected by it. The Doctors differ in their theory of treatment: some recommend no medicine—others are for the lancet and blisters. But those once thoroughly imbued with its influences *cannot be cured*. It bids fair, however, contrary to all other epidemics, to improve the health of its subjects; and, on this account, it is by no means so alarming as it once was. In Georgia it is expected that the "Stars" in their courses will fight against it; but I am of opinion their influence will be found too weak long to save the people from the contagion. EDITOR.

*From the Religious Inquirer.*

THE following is extracted from *Franklin's Life;* and as it shows his opinion of the utility of bare Calvinism, as well as a singular cast of mind which could enable a preacher to draw such doctrines from such a text, it may serve to amuse the reader, while it exposes the folly of the preacher:—

"Though I seldom attended public worship, I had still an opinion of its propriety, and of its utility, when properly conducted, and I regularly paid my annual subscription for the support of the only Presbyterian minister or meeting we had in Philadelphia. He used to visit me sometimes as a friend, and admonish me to attend his administrations; and I was now and then prevailed on to do so—once for five Sundays successively. Had he been in my opinion a good preacher, perhaps I might have continued, notwithstanding the occa-

sion I had for the Sunday's leisure in my course of study; but his discourses were either polemic arguments, or explications of the peculiar doctrines of "our sect," and were all, to me, very dry, uninteresting, and unedifying; since not a single moral principle was inculcated or enforced; their aim seeming to be rather to make us *Presbyterians* than *good citizens.*

At length he took for his text that verse of the 4th chapter of Philippians—"Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, or are of good report, if there be any virtue, or any praise, think on these things." And I imagined in a sermon on such a text, we could not miss having some morality. But he confined himself to five points only, as meant by the Apostle, viz. 1. Keeping holy the Sabbath day. 2. Being diligent in reading the Holy Scriptures. 3. Attending duly the public worship. 4. Partaking of the sacrament. 5. Paying due respect to God's ministers.

These might be all good things; but as they were not *the kind* of good things that I expected from that text, I despaired of ever meeting with them from any other—was disgusted, and attended his meeting no more."

## ANOTHER PAPER FOR REFORM.

"PROSPECTUS, for publishing in Jeffersonville, Ind. a monthly paper, called *THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW,* edited by Nathaniel Field and Beverly James.

The editors assure the public that they have not undertaken this work with a view to their interest or advantage; but, on the contrary, from a wish to aid, so far as their limited talents can be employed, in the dissemination of *truth,* for which they are willing to sacrifice all personal considerations. They are resolved to espouse the cause of no sectarian church, creed, or formulary; but to illustrate, recommend, and defend the gospel as the only standard of the Christian religion, comprising all things necessary to be believed and practised. They will labor to effect the re-establishment of the primitive doctrine and worship of the Christian church, pointing out their beauty, harmony, and simplicity; occasionally reviewing the various conflicting and discordant and sectarian systems invented, adopted, and obeyed since the commencement of the Grand Apostacy; fairly and honestly examining their past utility and ultimate tendency. A variety of other topics shall occupy our columns, interwoven with the peace and prosperity of the Christian church. The editors would therefore cherish a hope of success in the prosecution of this work, from a conviction that its object is appreciated and ardently desired by thousands, on whose liberality they rely for patronage sufficient to reimburse its expences.

CONDITIONS.—The *Christian Review* will be published on the first Monday in every month, and will contain 24 duodecimo pages, printed on good type, at One Dollar per annum, payable in advance."

## HINTS IN REPLY TO ANDREW BROADDUS.

*Dear Sir*—LAST night (June 4) I returned from an excursion to Cincinnati and the adjacent parts of Kentucky. I was absent thirty days—pronounced twenty-five lectures—held many conversations—introduced fourteen citizens into the kingdom of Jesus Christ—performed a journey of eight hundred miles by land and water—was much refreshed in spirit—and now find myself in my writing chair, surrounded with many communications, and before me lying your strictures on *Christianos and the 8th chapter of Romans.*

After feasting on the word of life, after rejoicing in the songs of Zion, and in the prayers and the communion of the saints, for four weeks—judge my feelings on sitting down to pick the dry bones of speculative theology, as detailed in your controversial view of the 26th verse of the 8th chapter of the Romans! To comfort the saints and to exhort sinners, I introduced this topic at the Bowling Green in January last; and now in June, when every thing is blooming around me, warmed by the genial influences of the season, up comes the skeleton, dry and haggard, of a subject which warmed myself and my hearers in the cold days of January last. The demon of orthodoxy and the spirit of departed creeds have withered the flesh and blasted the health and beauty of many a precious subject of holy truth. Why is it, brother Broaddus, that spiritual anatomists are so fond of the charnel house, always preferring the bones of a dead subject to the living word of God and the healthy man in Christ Jesus?

I have now learned, from the best authority, that you are the author of "*Christianos.*" So unlike to the "*Paulinus*" of the Christian Baptist is the "*Christianos*" of the Religious Herald, that I hope you will pardon me for withholding my assent to some representations referring these productions to you, until I was assured by your own signature that *Paulinus* has been converted into *Christianos.* Had I had this assurance sooner, perhaps a different course might have been pursued in my notices of *Christianos.* But what I have written was called for by your signal of alarm, and your strictures upon the commission and upon the verse before us. Forgetting the things that are behind, and turning my attention to the letter before me, I must premise that the sensibility exhibited by yourself on this subject still more clearly appears to me to be a *morbid* sensibility. It appears so from your own concessions: for, according to your views, previously expressed, the operations of the Holy Spirit are not to be controlled by our sentiments, *pro* or *con.* The advocates for what I call *mystic* operations—you *special*, or *sovereign*, or *irresistible operations*—contend that, on the most guilty and polluted hearts, the Holy Spirit often, in a sovereign way, operates with, or without the word, to produce regeneration, and that, too, independent of our theory upon the subject. Now if you denied this, or, what is the same thing, if you taught that the Holy Spirit is governed by our faith, or sentiments, or theory of regeneration, then it would not evince a morbid sensibility

to see you contend for a peculiar theory according to which the Spirit must operate.

To contend about the meaning of a verse appears to you a matter of some moment, especially one on which so much reliance has been placed in proof of the popular doctrine of spiritual operations. To me it is of no importance farther than it may serve to give that clearness and force to a practical exhortation or suggestion of the inspired Apostles, which modern interpreters and sermonizers have measurably destroyed. I have no doubt but you *feel* as much as you express upon this subject, and that you are satisfied with your own reasons for your own interpretation. To me, however, you appear not to have met, fairly met, the objections presented in my remarks to your interpretation, and not in the least to have extricated your comment from the difficulties which have always encompassed it.

You have given an importance to my remarks on this passage to which I did not think them entitled. If your strictures, signed "*Christianos*," had not appeared, in all probability my discourse at Bowling Green would have been, for the most part, forgotten, and my heresy, if it be one, would have passed quietly to oblivion. I sought no occasion to give greater publicity to a disquisition which, I humbly think, places in a clear and consolatory light a passage generally misunderstood, than the extemporaneous remarks which that congregation called for.

Permit me, then, very briefly to show wherein it appears to me you have not succeeded in establishing your own views, nor in disproving mine. Your first position is a good one if you had followed it out—"*Follow common sense and the common rules of interpretation!*" These you profess to follow. You *assume* that, inasmuch as the Spirit of God is frequently referred to in the previous part of the 8th chapter, common sense would suppose that it is the Spirit of God, and not *our* spirit, which is spoken of in the 26th verse. It is a fact that the term *spirit* in the previous part of this chapter always means the Spirit of God? It is used in this chapter, verse 1, to denote *the gospel*, contradistinguished from the law, or flesh. So also, verses 4, 5, 6, and 9. In verse 10 it is used to denote our own spirit contrasted with *the body*: "The body is dead because of sin; *the spirit* is life because of righteousness." Besides, *the spirit of Christ*, *the spirit of bondage*, and *spirit of adoption*, as well as *the Spirit of God*, are introduced in the same chapter; and please mark what follows: the verse preceding this context (ver. 16) contradistinguishes the Spirit of God from *our spirit*. Now, *with our spirit in his eye*, the Apostle begins this disquisition: "The Spirit of God beareth witness with *our spirit* that we are the children of God. How, then, brother Broaddus, could you apply the rule of common sense and the rules of interpretation to this case to prove that we ought to take for granted that the Holy Spirit was intended in the subsequent part, because alluded to in the preceding part of the chapter? Out of *seventeen* times which the word *spirit* occurs in the preceding 16 verses of this chapter, it is far from evident that the Spirit of God, in your sense, is alluded to more than

four, or, at most, *five* times! So much for your strongest point—though but prefatory, I call it your strongest point.

Your second point is not, in my judgment, more decisive in your favor than the first. The addition of a pronoun purely *demonstrative* can never be called a characteristic *adjunct*. I am willing to admit that *auto* (itself or himself) in both cases is demonstrative; but of what?—of the spirit, the subject of the preceding proposition. For example; the Spirit of God is the subject of the proposition in the 14th verse; the 15th verse is intercalary or explanative of another matter; and to connect the subject of the proposition with the purpose for which it is introduced the demonstrative pronoun "*itself*," verse 16, precedes it. To this, I think, you will have no objection. Now the *auto* (itself) in the second clause of verse 26. is just used in the same way. It demonstrates what spirit is intended, and the subject of the proposition in the first clause is alleged to be our spirit, to which the demonstrative *auto* (itself) in the second clause alludes. If you will not admit this, then I am constrained to say that the pronoun *itself* or *himself* is applied to the wrong subject for you; for upon your own principle it ought to have been attached to the term *spirit* in the first clause, verse 26, which is the subject of the proposition. *But it is not.* It, therefore, not being attached to the proper noun for your hypothesis, leaves you no adjunct for the subject of debate. To have suited your purpose it ought to have read, *Likewise the Spirit itself*, or himself, *also helps our infirmities.* But not reading thus, it makes your rule inapplicable. As it is, the demonstrative pronoun in the second clause logically and grammatically only proves that the *spirit* in the second clause is the same mentioned in the first clause, and that that is the Spirit of God you have yet to prove. As yet it is only assumed.

Your next point of defence is to obviate the difficulty that the Spirit is in no passage of scripture, other than that in dispute, said to *intercede* for the saints. You have not attempted to produce any other; and, therefore, to prove that doctrine by the passage in dispute, is, if not to beg the question, so near it, that I want discrimination to discover the difference.

Concerning the doctrine of the Spirit of God being an intercessor *within* us, contrasted with Jesus an intercessor *without* us, I must, brother Broaddus, while admiring your ingenuity, say, that on that subject I have no revelation; neither can I discover any analogy between John xvi. 13. and the Holy Spirit's interceding for the saints. The Saviour there promised a *Monitor* to bring all things to the remembrance of the Apostles, or an *Advocate* to assist them in pleading his cause. To convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment, to speak of Christ, and neither of the *saints* nor of *himself*, constitute the work of this Advocate.

Feeling no desire to contend about the meaning of a verse, nor for my views of it, especially where sentiment rather than practice—where opinion rather than faith, is concerned—I cannot consent to the employment of many pages in such disquisitions. I aim at nothing

more in the preceding remarks than to show that your view is a forced one, and that the objections made to it are not, in my judgment, removed, nor lessened. I might add that the verse succeeding this disputed passage, viz. the 28th, admirably sustains the views I have given of the whole connexion. After having spoken of the *bodily* sufferings of christians and the groans of *their spirits*, he adds, "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God." Amongst these "*all things*" you place the intercession of the Holy Spirit, which I humbly conceive is incompatible with the whole passage and your general views of that Divine Agent. I feel no solicitude to impose my views upon you nor the christian community, and would have had no material objection to have published your letter without any rejoinder farther than to request the reader to compare it with the essay on this subject, No. 3, page 111. If, after such a comparison, he inclines to your conclusions, I will not disturb his repose by obtruding mine upon him. If otherwise, I hope you will grant him the same indulgence, and not think the less of him because he could not coincide with you.

I am glad, I assure you, brother Broaddus, to see that you are still on the side of reform; though, indeed, the reform for which you contend is not so radical nor extensive as that which is deemed by many pious and talented brethren to be absolutely necessary to the restoration of the ancient order of things. Were all the churches on the continent reformed to the utmost extent of that reformation for which you contend, as far as I am acquainted with it, still there would be need for several reformations before they could come up to the model which the Apostles built. However, I have long since learned not to despise the day of small things, and am therefore glad to hear you say, *Reform.*

The greatest objection which I have to the present order of things, is, because it so obviously fails in producing those joyful experiences of the love of God and the hope of heaven, which so universally and so forcibly appeared in all the sincere converts made by the first promulgers of the gospel. For unless the peace of God rule in the heart, and the love of God be diffused within us, I place no value in any profession of the religion of the Messiah.

In conclusion I must add, that I am assured that so soon as some essays on christian experience, which I have in contemplation, appear, you will find that you have been more alarmed than the occasion required; and give me leave to add, that as the "acidity" of my remarks on *Christianos* has sweetened to my taste the temper of the *propria persona*, I shall now administer antacids so long as the present healthy indications appear.

Wishing to see you not only *almost*, but *altogether* a reformer, permit me subscribe myself,

Yours for the hope's sake,

EDITOR.

*Extract of a letter to the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger, dated*

HARTFORD, Con. May 17th, 1830.

*My dear Brother,*

FORBEARING one another in love, in respect to some few diversities, I say in regard to your main object, *God speed you!* To excite the attention of the disciples of Jesus to his pure testimony, and to expose, in the spirit of meekness, with love to truth, the numerous traditions of men, which pride and covetousness have originated, and which have so extensively corrupted christians from the simplicity of their Master, is a noble object. To be engaged in this cause with purity of motive, is our high duty and privilege, and cannot fail of bringing peace into our bosoms. Go forward, my brother, wielding the sword of the Spirit, and taking the shield of faith wherewith you shall quench all the fiery darts of calumny and vengeance which the carnal opposers of the ancient order and primitive simplicity of the New Testament may hurl against you. Keep straight on, fixed on your main object, and beware of the device of the evil one to distract your mind, and divert your attention from the grand point, by drawing it too much to personal controversy. Armed with the panoply of *truth*, you need not fear; the opposing shafts will fall harmless at your feet.

I borrowed the first number of the *Millennial Harbinger* of a friend, and cherish the hope that, by divine favor, this work will be useful as a means of rendering the professed followers of the Lamb more worthy of the high character of the true church of God, which is "*the ground and pillar of the truth.*" I regret that you have applied the passage, "King eternal, immortal, and invisible," (which certainly is applied in the word of truth to none but "the only wise God,") to the Son of God; because it tends to lead the mind away from the pure testimony respecting the character of the *one God* who is the FATHER. On reflection I think you must be conscious that, although you did affirm expressly that the passage is applied to Jesus, your readers must so apprehend you, as I certainly did myself until I read your "Reply to brother I." I desire to believe every thing, and will say every thing concerning "the only begotten of the Father," my dear Saviour, which the Scriptures say; but I sincerely regret that the minds of the disciples have been so beclouded and confused by the trinitarian dogma, that they cannot clearly perceive the simple and glorious truth that "God is *one*," and that this one God is "*the Father.*" And allow me in brotherly love, and for the truth's sake, to tell you frankly, that I cannot but think that it is doubly inconsistent for such "a lover of pure speech" as brother Campbell, to write in any manner to darken divine counsel on this important subject.

Although I suppose that faith is "a conviction of the truth of any position from evidence," I am persuaded that the statement of "R. T. Brown," "that faith in Jesus Christ is nothing more than a belief of the facts recorded of him by the Evangelists, to wit: that Jesus of

Nazareth was the promised Messiah, and that he gave impregnable proof of his divine mission by his miraculous birth, by the numerous miracles which he wrought while living, and by his death, resurrection, and ascension," is very deficient. In addition to these facts we must surely believe *the truth*, "*the doctrine of the Lord*," which the Son of God came down from heaven as the true Prophet to teach. Praying for his disciples, he said, "I have declared unto them thy name and will declare it." I have no doubt many have been, and now are, convinced that Christ was a teacher from God, and believe the above recorded facts, who notwithstanding are unreformed in heart and life, because they do not believe the holy truth of the Son of God respecting the law of God and the consequent evil of sin which is the transgression of it. They do not believe the truth which came by Jesus Christ. Men may believe the recorded facts respecting the birth, death, and ascension of the Messiah, while they do not believe, but wilfully reject, the holy truth those facts were designed to establish. I know persons who fully believe that the Son of God died on the cross, and yet do not believe that his death has any particular connexion with the forgiveness of sin. Others I know, who entertain no doubt of those facts, and yet do not believe Christ's testimony concerning the justice of God, or that there is any danger of his destroying both soul and body in hell. I think, therefore, that to represent that the faith on the Son of God which is required of men for salvation, is nothing more than a belief of the facts above stated, is most dangerous to the souls of men, as it tends to establish the false hope of acceptance with God, while they do not believe the most important truth of the "Faithful Witness."

While we admit that faith is "a conviction of the truth of any position from evidence," we must also admit that the inclination of the will does bias the judgment, so that the evidence which would be sufficient to produce conviction where the mind is unbiassed, is not sufficient to produce it where such bias exists. A man may be convinced by the historical evidence, of the fact of the death of Jesus Christ; and at the same time, through the influence of the pride of his heart, he may not be convinced by the evidence exhibited in the divine word, that this sacrifice was necessary "that God might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." How forcible was that question of the Saviour to the Jews, "How can ye believe which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor which cometh from God only?" Does not the True Prophet clearly teach us that the carnal principle, the love of the world, is a barrier to believing? Was not sufficient evidence of the truth presented to their understandings to convince them of the truth, if they had not been biassed by their depraved disposition of heart? If, then, this carnal principle, this love of sin, excludes the truth from the mind, must it not be removed in order for the truth to be received? Aside from all systems of men, which I wish to discard with you, is it not the manifest requirement of God, that men should *repent* and believe the gospel? Paul testified wherever he went, "repentance towards God, and

faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." And what is repentance but that holy change, which, if I understand you, you do not consider as essential to the very act of believing the truth of the gospel, but as the *effect* of it? And while the Scriptures of truth appear to represent that repentance towards God does, in the order of things, precede faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, is it not the fact that the sinner never does believe in Christ as a Saviour from sin, until he penitently feels himself to be a sinner before God? What motive can he have to believe in Christ as a Saviour from sin and death, while he remains impenitent and is insensible of his need of such salvation? It must be admitted, indeed, that the act of repentance implies knowledge and faith respecting God, and sin as the transgression of his holy law, but the mind apprehending Christ as the appointed medium of divine forgiveness, must necessarily be a subsequent act (in the nature of things) to repentance for sin. Thus we require those who have offend ed us to repent in order to be forgiven. Nor is it possible for any man properly to *accept forgiveness* either from God or man, while he remains impenitent.

That it is the immediate duty of all men to repent, and of all who hear the gospel to believe it, is true; but this is not the whole truth. It is equally true that sinners will not do what they ought to do; they will not come unto Christ that they may have life. And marvellous, indeed, is the favor of God towards a world of determined rebels, in exalting Christ at his own right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, and *to give repentance* and remission of sins. "Of his own will," saith the Apostle, "begat he us by the word of truth." To the question, "Who maketh thee to differ?" or, Why have we come to the feast, while others forever make light of it, and forever refuse? the word of truth furnishes us an answer, which the glory of God and every emotion of grateful love demand we should never forget. "God, who is rich in mercy for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by favor ye are saved) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. For by favor are ye saved, through faith, *and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God.*"

You speak of Mr. Fuller's regenerated unbeliever. Might I not, with equal propriety, speak of Mr. Campbell's believing impenitent? I believe with you, that it is by the knowledge, and love, and practice of the truth, that men are saved. But a Paul may plant this truth, and an Apollos may water it, and all will be in vain except *God giveth the increase.*

The favor of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen.

Yours, in christian love,

HENRY GREW.

---

## REPLY TO HENRY GREW.

*Dear Brother*—I HAVE not affirmed that the phrase "King eternal, immortal, and invisible," is unequivocally applied to Jesus the Messiah. But when you affirm that it *certainly* is applied to none but

to the only wise God, I am inclined to suggest to you a doubt which I have upon this subject.

In the words immediately preceding this doxology, or ascription of praise, the Apostle is glorifying the Lord Jesus. This he does by making himself a monument of the great mercy of the Lord. And having said that he obtained mercy, that in him, *the chief of sinners*, Christ Jesus might show forth all long suffering for a pattern to them who should hereafter believe in him to life everlasting; what could be more natural for him than to add, "Now to the King eternal, immortal, and invisible"—"Now to the only wise God be honor and glory forever"—I say, what could be more natural than to praise the Lord Jesus? At the time in which Paul wrote he was the only King of the Universe—he is to reign for ever, and is now immortal and invisible. But he adds, "*To the wise God alone*," or, "*To the only wise God;*" hence some have made the "King eternal, immortal, and invisible," the same with "the only wise God." I read this passage with Macknight: "Now to the King eternal, immortal, and invisible, to the wise God alone," presuming that the first clause may refer to the Lord Jesus, and the second to his God and our God. Similar in construction is the conclusion of the letter of Jude: "To him who is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy—to the wise God alone, our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and throughout all ages." The term *wise* in both passages is of doubtful authority. I am little disposed to dogmatize on any subject, and still less on this one. I would only suggest a caution to those who are too apt to be positive where there is not the most decisive evidence. We have no King now but the Lord Jesus. God has made him the head over all things, and placed him upon the throne of universal dominion. And if Jesus be not to all, he is doubtless to some, *the King eternal, immortal, and invisible.* And while glorifying him, we are easily led to give glory to God alone as the fountain of all salvation; for he so loved the world as to send his only begotten Son, and when he humbled himself he exalted him to his own right hand, and *made him Lord* as well as Messiah.

I see, brother Grew, you are off to Fullerism in a twinkling, so soon as you get upon faith and repentance; and to bring me into contact with this scheme you array before me a "believing impenitent." I had hopes that you had got into the *temperate* zone, and abandoned the high and cold regions of icebergs and regenerated infidels. The believing unbeliever and the believing impenitent are not the creatures of Christ's school. And it is enough for me to know that I have with me the Lord Jesus and all his Apostles, in affirming, that whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Messiah, is born of God, overcomes the world, and, provided only he obeys the mould of doctrine into which he was cast when immersed into the name of Jesus, he will attain unto the resurrection from the dead.

This is not with me the *mollia tempora scribendi*, the acceptable time of writing, upon this theme. Every disquisition which goes to

make the manner of believing and repenting, or the order of repentance and faith essential points of doctrine, naturally tends to substitute a human system for the gospel of God, and to make the plainest declarations of the Oracles of non-effect.

On the principle that faith must precede all knowledge, repentance, reformation, obedience, I stand—because I find the Apostles all standing on this point, and with all the reason in the world to sustain them. Without faith it is impossible to please God; because, without faith, there can be no knowledge of God; and how can a person love, fear, honor, obey, or come to an unknown person? Andrew Fuller is, in this one instance, as far out of the track of reason and revelation as ever was a materialist who made every effect its own cause.

All who resolve individual salvation into a mere act of sovereignty disarm the gospel of all its powers, make its author insincere, its promises and its arguments deceitful, an instrument of guile and double meanings, a parade of empty professions to save appearances; and, worse than all, mock our miseries and tantalize our feelings. To talk of any change of mind or heart, before faith, is as much at variance with all reason as it is with revelation. For he that approaches God in any way, must first *believe* that he is; and, if he come to him with any confidence, he must first believe that he is a rewarder of all who diligently seek him.

Dear brother, your remarks upon doctrine I cannot understand.—Do you mean that there can be doctrine without fact, or that the doctrine of Christ is any thing more than the meaning of the facts recorded by the four Evangelists? When you have read the previous numbers of this work I shall like to hear from you again. An essay in contemplation, on the forgiveness of sins, will, I hope, obviate some difficulty on this, as well as other topics embarrassing the minds of some of the sincere hearted. Farther than the preceding remarks go I cannot, at this time, attend to your favor before me. So long as you worship God in spirit, rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in feeling, or in previous holy dispositions, I will, notwithstanding a thousand discrepancies in opinion, recognize and regard you as a brother in the hope of immortality.

EDITOR.

## A MISSTATEMENT CORRECTED.

AMONG other calumnies now in circulation against me, it is said that I was tried and deposed before a Presbytery in Scotland, and refused admission into a Presbytery of Virginia because of my errors in doctrine or in practice.

Now be it known unto all men, that I never stood impeached before any tribunal, civil or ecclesiastical, in my life; save the Redstone Association once accused me of an erroneous sermon, to which I plead *Not Guilty*, and was acquitted. I never had a suit in any court since I received my name, and before that I have no recollection.

EDITOR.

## *RESTORATION OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF THINGS.*

A MEETING was held at May's Lick, Mason county, Kentucky, on the last Friday, Saturday, and Lord's day of May, for religious worship and edification. Brethren from several counties in the state of Kentucky attended the meeting. It was composed of the friends and advocates of the ancient gospel and ancient order of things.—We had the pleasure of meeting with many of the public, bold, and powerful advocates of reformation at this meeting, and of uniting with them in prayers, praise, reading, exhortation, and in breaking the symbolic loaf. It was a very happy meeting, and I trust a very profitable one. All was harmony, christian affection, and intense zeal for the purity, peace, and union of the disciples on earth, and for the conversion of the world. I could have wished that all the opponents of the ancient order of things had witnessed this meeting, and heard and seen all that passed. If their spiritual jaundice could be cured, I feel sanguine that such meetings and such interviews would be the most likely means to deliver them from that atrabilious malady, which is likely, if not soon removed, to terminate in some of the more violent and deadly spasmodic affections. The brethren, both public and private, (and there was a large assemblage of them present,) parted, as they had met, in the strong bands of christian affection—with increased zeal, and renewed energy in the great and good cause of emancipating the brotherhood from the deadly influences of human systems, and from the galling yoke of human authority in the kingdom of Immanuel. I could have wished to have seen present a few such men as Abner W. Clopton, and William T. Brantly, men who are ever and anon talking about the ignorance and want of piety among those who advocate the restoration; I say, I could have wished their presence for the sake of their conversion, or rather reformation from those anomalous obliquities in their course. I wish to draw no invidious comparison between the talents and piety of those on one or other side of the question of reform. We want to see more piety and talent on the side of reform—more long suffering, patience, and forbearance—more mildness, meekness, and condescension—more humility, and more of the bowels of mercies, and tender compassions which are in Christ Jesus our Lord. I repeat, we wish and pray for more of these in the army of reform; but when our opponents talk of their piety and talent on the side of remaining in Babylon, we only wish them to become better acquainted with those who are in all parts of this great country proclaiming the necessity of reform. I was, in my foolish way, about to boast a little in the comparative degree; but I remember it is written, "Let him that boasteth boast in the Lord." In the Lord, then, we will boast, that he is *consuming the man of sin with the spirit of his mouth.* Many are running to and fro, and knowledge is certainly increasing. May the good Lord prosper and bless every enterprize which may hasten the period when the knowledge of his glory shall cover the whole earth as the waters cover the sea. EDITOR.

## TO BROTHER "N—," OF MATTHEWS COUNTY, VA.

*Dear Brother,*—I AM sorry that you should be sorry only for an hour on the subject of the publication of the extracts from a former letter. I hope it will be the occasion of rousing your energies in the good cause of reformation.

My mild replies to Abner W. Clopton it seems are not mild enough for the mild brethren in your vicinity. I admit the truth of your remark, that his bad temper is no excuse for any other person's bad temper. But I know of no bad temper exhibited on my part towards him. He is rather an object of pity than of resentment. I am told he is frequently hypochondriacal, and that domestic troubles have soured his temper. Why, then, should I resent his petulancy, or measure to him in his own measures. I have no temptation of this sort. It is, then, my peculiar mode of treating religious hypochondriacs; but when I meet with such an opponent as Bishop Semple, I have no need for such weapons. My dear sir, if you will only examine your case of instruments, you will find saws and scissors, as well as lancets and knives. And he who supposes that I should write of *A. W. Clopton* as to *Bishop Semple*, acts as reasonably as he who would have you to discuss a tumor, spring a vein, eradicate a cancer, or probe an ulcer, by one and the same instrument.

In much haste and in all affection, yours,

EDITOR.

☞ WE intend shortly publishing one *extra* number of 48 pages, principally on the *Forgiveness of Sins*. In proportion as this work is patronized, we shall issue *extras*. We are anxious to lay before our readers an unbroken series of arguments, illustrations, and proofs, upon Faith, Reformation, Immersion, and the Forgiveness of Sins. For this purpose we shall devote one entire number, our *first extra*, to this subject.

☞ MANY communications are reluctantly postponed. The greatest efforts are making to create divisions and to blame them on us. Nero set Rome on fire, and blamed the Christians for it. Our course, as we shall again more fully show, is to avoid division—to unite and harmonize on the *One Foundation*. Our opponents are for excommunicating all who will not subscribe to their views; and while doing this, charge schisms and heresies upon us. If we do not furnish arguments to convince all who have any pretensions to reason and plain common sense, that all the turmoil and confusion now talked of, are the works of our adversaries—it will be because we cannot prove that two and two make four.

☞ WE are sorry that a derangement of the copy of some communications from *Philalethes* so confounded our compositor, that he was not able to continue, or rather introduce it in this number. We shall attend to it in our next.

☞ *Abner W. Clopton's* third essay is as void of argument as the former two. We shall attend to it in due time.

☞ *Elder John Taylor* and *Spencer Clack* in our next.

## *MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

Samuel Trevor, Pittsburg, 2 dollars. L I Fleming, Lexington, Ky. paid for A Ray, J Mills, and M Jones, New Castle, Ky. 2 dollars each. J D Barker paid for W Corwine and Miss A Donnovan, 2 dollars each. O Clapp, Mentor, Ohio, paid for B Blish, N Wirt, W Corning, J Curtis, J Root, J Jones, A Bishop, and Telegraph Office, 2 dollars each. L Wood, Mentor, Ohio, 2 dollars. J B Edwards, King William Court House, Va. paid for J C Edwards, A Edwards, E Littlepage, G W Price, T T Neale, and himself,

2 dollars each. A. Ellis, Georgetown, Ohio, two dollars, J. W. Jeffreys, Jeffrey's Store, Va. paid for J Ingraham 2 dollars. L. Haggard, for J. Tobin and C. R. Palmer, two dollars each; and one dollar for W. C. Swearingen. J. T. Bryan, Owingsville, Ky. paid for S. Wheeler, J. Dougherty, and himself, 2 dollars each. S. Button, Covington, Indiana, paid 4 dollars. O. Thomas, Roberts' Store, Ky. paid fifteen dollars for subscribers. S. Morgan, Millbrook, O. paid 2 dollars. A. Robbins and A. Monroe, Falmouth, Ky. paid 2 dollars each. J. Philips, Steubenville, O. 2 dollars. J Patton, jun. Paris, Ky. paid for L. Smith, S. Smith, T. Craig, J. Montgomery, and H. B. Partlow, 2 dollars each. J. L. Davis paid for J. Backstrom, J. Westbrook, B. Rowale, J. L. Ross, and A. Westbrook, 2 dollars each. A Reynolds paid for W. Whitman, J. Murphy, J. G. Haley, and R. Whitman, 2 dollars each. Miss J. Saunders, Va. paid 2 dollars. J. B. New, Vernon, Ind. 2 dollars. D. B. Barnhart, Rising Sun, Ind. 2 dollars. W. Churchill, Deerfield, O. paid for W. Smith, esq. A. Hubbard, and A. Alliston, 2 dollars each. T. M. Henley, Lloyd's, Va. paid for W. Dew, W. Harrison, Miss S. W. Hill. B. Temple, and T. B. Humphreys, 2 dollars each. J. Benton, Leedsville, N. Y. paid for C. Benton, Sarah Reed, Elizabeth Beeham, and himself, 2 dollars each. M. Clapp, Madison, Ind. 2 dollars. G. B. Craft, Merrittstown, Pa. 2 dollars. J. Bowman, Perryopolis, Pa. 2 dollars. S. Blaney, Pa. 2 dollars. J. R. Speer, Bellboro', Ten. paid 1 dollar. S. Stone, South Hill, Va. 2 dollars. M. Tremble, Sangamo, Illinois, paid for T. Sweat, A. Houghton, J. Bennett, W. Morgan, and A. Bergen, 2 dollars each. A. Kirkpatrick, Meigsville, Ten. paid for W. Kirkpatrick and N. Fisk, 2 dollars each. W. Jennings, Lancaster, Ky. paid for B. Poulson, 4 dollars; E. Sartin, J. Jennings, J. Meyers, and himself, two dollars each, and 1 dollar for J. Robinson. Sally Smith, Burnt Tavern, Ky. paid 2 dollars. N. Chinn, Leesburg, Ky. paid for J. G. Chinn, and L. Coppage, 2 dollars each. Z. Cornall, Spring Hill, Ind. paid $10 for subscribers. W. Clark, Greenville, N. C. 2 dollars. J. Short, Springville, Ind. 2 dollars. B. Sanford, Cincinnati, 2 dollars. H. Bosworth, Fredonia, N. Y. 2 dollars. D. Kirkland, O. 2 dollars. J. Noah, O. 2 dollars. G. W. Elley. Nicholasville, paid for L. Bryan, G. Holloway, J. Sale, and W. Sower, 2 dollars each. N. Ross, Martinsburg, O. paid 1 dollar. S. Fisher, East Fairfield, O. paid for J. B. Terrell and himself, 2 dollars each. H. Edwards, Bloomfield, Ky. paid for J. Stone, T. Stone, F. Stone, S. Miner, and N. Combe, 2 dollars each. The following persons paid for volume 1:—Col. J. Picket, Washington, Ky.; B. L. Abernethey, Pendleton, Ky.; Sennate Young, Flat Creek, Bath co. Ky.; John Allen, S. W. Robertson, R. W. Ingram, Mount Carmel, Fleming county, Ky.; H. Hathaway, West Alexandria, O.; Dr. Wooley, C. W. L'Hommidieu; Andrews & Shays, Dr. S. Jones, Thomas Murdock, John Waggoner, Warren Finch, Col. Francis Carr, M. Upjohn, Cincinnati; James Ray, William Holton, Daniel Runyan, Gen. D. Childs, paid through Daniel Runyan, Minerva, Ky.; Henry Kemper, Poplar Plains; J. Strode, Flemingsburg, Ky.; H. M. Bledsoe, Paris, Ky.; W. Poston paid for Wm. Webb, Laban Jones, William Morton, Winchester, Ky.; G. G. Boon paid for himself, S. Shivel, T. Christian, J. Davis, G. Allen, and J. M'Call, Athens, Ky.; Wm. Triplett, Flemingsburg, paid for John Henderson, Morton Green; A. W. Payne, Washington, Ky. paid for John Holton Thomas Morton, L. Cahill, Ed. Robertson, William Tureman, Wm. Markland, S. January, H. Maxton, Maysville, Ky.; Absalom Rice, Mount Sterling, Ky. paid for Jesse Glover, George Page, N. L. Lindsey, North Middleton, Ky. paid for Henry Bonta, Mason & Black, Bourbon, Ky.; Buckner H. Payne. John Smith, Mount Sterling; James Sims, North Middleton; Wm. Wilson, Washington, Ky.; D. W. Parish, Colbyville; R. Reed, Mount Sterling, Ky.; J. Evans, Flemingsburg, Ky.; N. Sidewell, Georgetown, Ohio; P. W. Wiles paid for T. M'Connell, J Mann, W. Ellis, T. M'Connatha, F. M'Connica, and himself, Ripley, Ohio; John Cailerman paid for himself, for Wm. Threlkeld, Jacob Bishop, Hazle Ware, Robert Allen, H. Bishop, and James Williams, Flemingsburg, Ky.; J. Rudolf, jun. paid for John Noah, Nelson, Ohio. Elder H. Grew, Hartford, Con. 3 dollars.

# THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 6. | BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1830. | Vol. 1.


I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## REVIEW OF "A HISTORY OF CLEAR CREEK CHURCH, AND CAMPBELLISM EXPOSED."—By JOHN TAYLOR, Frankfort, 1830—*Containing* 60 *duodecimo pages.*

PAUL no where commands old men to govern their passions. This was his charge to the *young*. The aged he exhorts to be sober, grave, temperate, healthy by faith, love, and patience. He presumed it unnecessary to say a word to old men on governing their passions, because experience and the decline of animal vigor would most likely divest them of that excitability which appears in youth.

To see an old man, who has filled almost his fourscore years, coming forward in the gravity and affection of an aged disciple, full of the fruits of that wisdom which comes from above, affords quite a different entertainment from that which this aged disciple has furnished. We must ascribe it to the system rather than to the man; or, perhaps I should add to the system, his dotage.

Much has been said of a christian spirit, and the want of a christian spirit, by our opponents. We shall look to them for a model, and who amongst them so likely to furnish that model as old *John Taylor*, who boasts much of having been killed by the law, quickened by the Spirit, and is just waiting for heaven. He counts nearly or quite two years for my one. Mellowed down with the christian charity of his system, we may expect in him the perfection of love. We shall only premise that his object in these 60 pages appears to be threefold:—1st. To attribute all the troubles of the Clear Creek Church to the brethren *Creaths* and some other reforming brethren—to lay all the divisions, swellings, and tumults, to the friends of reform. 2d. To prejudice the public, the christian public, against the reforming preachers and people; and, in the third place, to produce a division of the Elkhorn Association—to have all the friends and advocates of reform cast out of that connexion. These constitute the burthen of the little book. Concerning the 1st object: I have seen in Kentucky a certificate signed by some of the first members of the community, attesting the injustice of the first charge, and proving, from unques-

tionable documents, that the difficulties in the Clear Creek Church originated not from any preaching upon the subject of reform. Indeed, the pamphlet itself is full proof of this matter.

I know my readers in general will feel but little interest in this matter, and we will proceed to let this old disciple speak for himself. In the prosecution of his great object he says many things, of which the following is a fair specimen:—

"I ask leave of the friends of Campbell to make a comparison," page 8. "It may be remembered that Daniel's goat was Alexander the Great. The same goat pretty well figures out our Alexander. Daniel's goat killed a ram with two horns, and then conquered the world. Our goat, as he thinks, has, in public debate, put two Presbyterian ministers to flight, and after that conquered the infidel Owen. Daniel Parker is another goat like himself. One we will call the East Goat, the other (Daniel Parker) the West Goat." In page 43 he calls Jacob Creath, sen. and Jacob Creath, jun. his "brothers Creath." Of these brethren he teaches the young thus to speak:—"If the cunning of one Jacob could beguile and obtain the birthright from an elder brother, by deceit obtain the blessing from a patriarchal father, and overreach a wary father-in-law, what has not religious society to apprehend from the combined cunning of two Jacobs?" "Why should Creath be thus mischievous? I did not before know that my old brother Creath was so near a kinsman, or so much like Jeroboam the son of Nebat; for I have never seen this wicked man and his sin so fully exemplified as in the present case." p. 41. "They set men to baptizing who do not preach at all. This is Jeroboamism connected with Campbellism." p. 42. "The two Jacobs have lately set up another golden calf at Benson: for Jeroboam set up two—one at Bethel, and the other at Dan." p. 42. "My young Jacob I have ranked with king Abimelech, of whom he has a great favor. My grey-headed Jacob I have connected with king Jeroboam." p. 43. "Should he now step in, I would, perhaps, unwittingly say, How'do, brother Jeroboam Creath." p. 44.

Concerning other very distinguished men who have been the instruments of much good in converting men, and in reforming society, he speaks in the same style. "I have named Morton as one of the intruders. It may be he is the most innocent man among all the intruders at Clear Creek, for it is probable he knows no better; for being very self-willed and self-conceited, he only takes notice of one side of the question; and should he never have felt the power of godliness, he is more to be pitied than blamed. From all that I can hear of him he doports himself well, so that I am willing to consider him a well meaning man with all the chaff that is about him." p. 21. "These revolutionizers, Creath and Morton." "Where was the grey-headed Creath, Bullock, James Sullivan, and others?" "About two years ago Jacob Creath, sen. and W. Morton, had what is *called* a great revival of religion at Nicholasville. More than 100 were baptized." "One thing their zeal prompted them to do was preaching against all creeds and confessions of faith." "Has Bullock changed since that time? I highly esteem Bullock, and am afflicted that he should be a man given to change." "John Smith was in company. I have long known him, and had a high opinion of him as a minister of Christ." "These reformers must have a contentious noise, from mere love to that kind of noise." "Who would do this but brazen-faced Baptist Reformers?" p. 26. "What is all this but disgusting bravado—a mere puff of filthy scum." "O when will the Baptists behave more like christians!" *With such examples before them, I cannot think it will be far hence.*

The old man reserves his best blessing for me. Speaking of an interview with me in 1824, not the first but the *second* time I visited Kentucky, (in the date he is mistaken) he says, "Had I known (at the time I looked in his face and took leave of him) what the Prophet Elisha knew when he settled his countenance on the face of Hazael and wept, I should have wept too. This

Hazael was servant to the king of Syria. The Prophet knew he would be king and greatly afflict Israel; therefore he wept. The first exploit done by Hazael was to kill his master, and then overturn the kingdom of Israel. What mischief Campbell did before he left the Presbyterians, I am not fully apprized; but that he has been a second edition of Hazael among the Baptists we know at least." p. 48. "I am constrained to think of the whole plan as infidelity under a mask. I call it an apostacy such as we never have before known among the Baptists, and a prelude to their own eternal overthrow." "Piety to God and good order in a church they have an aversion to; anarchy and confusion seems to be their element." p. 49. "Deluded mortals! They talk of government by the scriptures!" "That there is a change in these outlandish renegadoes is evident; but whether for the better is another thing." p. 51. Speaking of his law-work, he says of me, "Campbell, from every thing we can hear from him, has always had the art of dodging his neck from God's killing knife (the law,) and no wonder that men should shun this deadly blow: for a common hog will dodge his throat from the killing knife, and except it go to the heart you will not hear the dying groan." p. 57. Speaking of the reforming brethren, he adds, "Those buzzard men smelled the putrid carnage of contention—having a particular pleasure in mingling in this kind of filth." [So writes and speaks this christian minister in his old days! These are they who talk of a christian spirit.]

If such a Hazael as I dare approach such a venerable disciple as the aged *John Taylor*, I would say to him, Is it thus that you have learned Christ? Is it thus that you imitate the Apostle John, whom you call your "*namesake?*" Are your last works, your speeches, and this pamphlet, in the spirit and temper of the last productions of the aged disciple and Apostle John? Will not the young men be emboldened by your example to abound in all clamor, and bitterness, and evil speaking—to hear you say, that you are just waiting to be released—ripe for heaven, like a shock of corn in full harvest—that you are about to repose in Abraham's bosom, while such reproaches, calumnies, and slanders, are flowing from your trembling fingers, and dropping from your feeble tongue? What sort of license do you afford to the young disciples, and what countenance do you give to the uncourteous, indocile, and daring rebel, who refuses submission to the yoke of Jesus? "Few of us speak with less courtesy," they will say, "few of us are more rancorous, frothy, light, giddy, and scurrilous, than an old man panting to be glorified." I heard a gentleman say the other day that you told him, some years since, you wished to die; that you were afraid to live longer lest you should dishonor the cause. He has not yet obeyed the gospel, and the frothiness, wantonness, not to say the maliciousness, in appearance at least, of your production, not only emboldens him, but warrants many others in continuing in the excesses of the Gentiles who know not God. Does not James say, "If a man bridle not his tongue his religion is vain"? And may not some say, "If old John Taylor has bridled his tongue, then has mine been bridled all my life." I would, if one so criminal and so young as I, dare entreat or beseech one so faultless in his own eyes, and so near the confines of the eternal world—I say, I would beseech him to repent and publish a recantation to the world. I would not for the whole commonwealth; nay, for the universe, appear before the Judge of All with my tongue and my hand polluted with such

reproachful words against the saints of the Most High; leaving among my last works on earth a monument, a memorial of the gall and wormwood of my unsanctified passions and affections. I would not for the wealth of Crœsus, the eloquence of Demosthenes, the wisdom of Solomon, appear in a company of angels (to say nothing of the God of angels) with that pamphlet in my hand as its author, filled as it is with calumnies and reproaches against the most exemplary and useful christians in the commonwealth of Kentucky—I will not say a word for any out of that commonwealth implicated in the accusation. I only ask, or would, if I might be permitted to ask, Who in the commonwealth of Kentucky, either among the teachers or taught, are more worthy of christian affection and esteem than the persons named in this pamphlet? Who among the public men have led more exemplary lives, exhibited more intelligence and piety, than the advocates of reform? Who have been more useful, more devoted, and more successful than they? Were I to travel out of the record, and array the advocates of reform in the bounds of your immediate vicinities, taking some ten of the counties adjoining you; taking into view the public and private men, to say nothing of the sisters who have in all reforms been among the first to stand up for the Lord and his cause; I say, were these to be selected, and some who are so much in favor of reformation as to be afraid to go with you, but stand on middle ground—how many would you have left to boast of for talent, information, and piety? You say brother Vardeman is for the middle ground, and some other influential men are for the middle ground. I will not stop to inquire into the meaning of these middle ground brethren. In general the middle men have their judgment on one side, and their affections or feelings, or passions or interests, or something not intellectual, on the other. Whether their judgment is on the side of reform, or their affections, I will not at this time inquire. But so soon as you exclude all the reforming brethren, public and private advocates of reform, your society assuredly will have lost much of its saltness and its seasoning, as well as its members.

But to the most interesting point in this pamphlet. It is this: The author's great object is to produce a division, a schism, in the Baptists in Kentucky. He wishes the Elkhorn Association to excommunicate the *Reformers*, as he calls them, and then the other Associations will follow their example, and thus make a new sect or heresy from North to South in Kentucky. When this rent is perfected, then the Reformers are to be blamed for it—as Nero, when he fired Rome, blamed it on the christians.

John the Apostle said, "He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abides in the light; but he that hates his brother, is in darkness, and walks in darkness, and knows not whither he goes, for darkness has blinded his eyes. He that loves not his brother, abides in death. Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loves is born of God and knows God. He that loves not, knows not God; for God is love. We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." Now let us hear his aged "namesake:"—

"I well remember that I find it recorded" [not in the writings of John, but] "in the Minutes of the Elkhorn Association of 1786 that when a church refuses to take the advice of the Association she shall be denied a seat there, provided the advice is not contrary" [to the Apostle John? No:] "to the *terms* of the General Union." "I ask, Will she now suffer herself to be imposed upon by" [her brethren] "a few headlong or headstrong men?" p. 38.

Love suffers long and is kind, bears all things, believes all things, endures all things. Love never fails, said an Apostles.

"In this flagrant outrage on good order, what is to be done? Let each church aggrieved make themselves well acquainted with their affairs, and send on a request" [for the excommunication of these brethren] "and let the Association act on it promptly." p. 39. [Yes, let the Association act promptly.—*What thou doest, do quickly.*] "At next Elkhorn Association they will be sure to be put out of their stewardship." p. 43. "Other Associations will follow the example." "My *brothers* Creaths will not be displeased with this plain course I take with them." p. 43.

No: good-natured men, they will not be displeased with their brother John Taylor, who wishes to see them beheaded for their testimony before he goes to heaven. They could not be so hard-hearted as to refuse their good old brother Taylor the sweet satisfaction of keeping the garments of those who would stone them to death. It would be cruel in them not to let this aged disciple smell the sweet savor of their blood. They would not be guilty of hating their brother Taylor: for the old Apostle said, "He that hates his brother is a murderer, and you know that no murderer has eternal life abiding in him."

Those on the vantage ground can easily settle the question of truth and error by singing a war song, and by crying, "*To your tents, O Israel!*" Bring them before the Association, and there we shall count noses, and on which ever side there are the most noses, that is the side on which stands the truth. I never had much faith in Sanhedrims, because they have, to say the least, been oftener wrong than right. In the Sanhedrim which condemned the Messiah to death, the votes stood for crucifying, 70; for releasing, 2, (Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea.) Jesus had two votes out of seventy-two. This event has incurably prejudiced me against ecclesiastical councils.

But why this proscription? Have any of the Reformers denied any one of the *seven* pillars on which Wisdom has builded her house? I speak after the manner of men. Has any one of them denied the one Lord, the one faith, the one immersion, the one God, the one Spirit, the one body, the one hope? Touching the one faith, have they denied any of the gospel facts? and do they, as concerning the one hope, deny the literal resurrection of the dead? If not, why denounce or proscribe them? Do they not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh literally; that he is the only begotten Son of God; and that he died for our sins, and rose again for our justification? But they will not dogmatize nor suffer others to dogmatize for them. They will not call John Taylor *Father*, only because of his age; not because of his opinions. Do they not live piously, humbly, honestly, and behave themselves courteously? If they do not, admonish them, reprove them; and if they do not reform exclude them. But for *thinking*,

*thinking differently* from old John Taylor, why decapitate them! If the brethren Creaths, Morton, Smith, Boon, &c. &c. are all too long for Elder Taylor's *iron bedstead*, cut off their toes, but save their heads. Procrustes, cruel as he was towards those who were too long for his bedstead, never decreed, that I have read, at which end they should begin with the knife. I hope Elder Taylor will not make a decree that the knife shall be always applied to the head because the head is the *thinking* organ.

But really, why charge the Reformers with divisions, while they say, You may indulge all your opinions, only let us enjoy our opinions; and so long as we are of *one* faith, let us walk according to that one faith? But up comes the Church Covenant, and it says so and so. "These Reformers will not let us keep our Church Covenant." I am of opinion this is not the fact. Keep your Covenant, all who like it, but do not impose it upon them who do not like it. Here is a church of one hundred members: they have a Covenant: sixty approve the Covenant, and forty do not. What is to be done? Exclude the forty! By whose authority? Not by Jesus Christ's authority. If you presume to cut off forty of his members because of your human contrivance, he will fight against you with the sword which proceeds out of his mouth. If you do, you are the schismatics, the heretics. You being sixty, and they being forty, alters not the case. "But the forty will not commune with us while we hold the Covenant." In this they may be wrong. If the Covenant be all that is in the way, if your behaviour be as becomes the gospel, they ought to bear with your Covenant. I would sit and let you read your Covenant till you got tired, if you will cut off its horns; or, if it happen to be a *muley*, you may turn it loose every day in the year, *Sundays only excepted*, and let it *butt* whom it may, so long as it cannot *gore*. Yes, I would let you have your plaything; but you must not turn your wooden fish into a living scorpion.

"But we cannot depart from our usual order." Well, be it so; but let those who feel disposed to obey God rather than men, meet every Lord's day, and worship God according to the New Covenant. Go and look at them. If you have better memories and warmer affections than they, that you need not so often commemorate the Lord's death, it would be cruel in you to say that they who are weaker christians than you, have colder affections, and more imbecile memories, shall have to keep as long from the Lord's table and the worship of his house, as you, who, because of your greater affections for the Saviour, and stronger recollections, need not to meet at his table more than once in a quarter. Bear with the infirmities of the weak. We are opposed to division. We will bear all things, only let us have the liberty you claim for yourselves—the liberty of worshipping our Father and our God according to our own consciences. In this tolerant and charitable way we will all come together who are friends of Jesus Christ. A little familiarity with christian usages, and with one another, will draw us to the living head, and warm our affections fowards one another. On these premises if there be divisions and

schisms, charge them not against us. If you do, charge cold and darkness upon the Sun.

And now had John Taylor the aged thrown himself into the breach; had he brought the weight of his years and all his remaining energies into the field of conciliation; and, had he a tear to spare, shed it over the first disciple who would not submit to such arguments, his memory would have been embalmed in the hearts of ten thousand christians, and he would have heard the Saviour say, "Happy the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God!" But now he sings the war-song—now he sounds the note of preparation—now he flings arrows, firebrands, and death into the camp, and calls upon his warriors to gild on their swords and hasten to the field.

I take no notice of any thing doctrinal in this pamphlet; there is little of any sort of doctrine in it except it be that of the capital *I* and the little *u*. He talks of some interviews with me, none of which are strictly correct. I attribute it to his treacherous memory. He has confounded events one year apart in time, and the coloring he has given to some conversations is quite bilious. I am sometimes mistaken in men, but I was not much mistaken in old John Taylor. I found him wayward, dogmatical, opinionative, and what some call self-willed. To this he had a right, perhaps, from his age; and, like most old men, he remembered and admired the scenes, and sentiments, and exploits of his youth, more than of his advanced years. He was converted to the views of immersion exhibited in my debate with Mr. M'Calla; but he was too old to stay converted. And now that he has apostatized from them, his last state is worse than the first.

Could I entreat him to atone for the ills he has done—could I induce him to do what a martyr once did—put that hand into the fire which in an evil hour signed his recantation, I am assured it might contribute to his happy exit, and wipe off a dishonor which otherwise will survive all his other indiscretions and tergiversations, which in a long life are the common lot of men. Should he, however, persist in this downward course, I need not the inspiration of a prophet to foresee the dark cloud which will not only obscure his setting sun, but also cast its dusky shade upon his tomb.

To conclude this notice of a work, already too long, a work which needs no other passport to the fabled river Styx than its own ghastly hue: I would ask its author to ponder well what wraths and strifes, what swellings and tumults he is about to create should he succeed in making a new division. And there is one question, the solution of which he ought to have prepared and proved; and that is, should he divide the Elkhorn Association, whether he will not contribute more to build up the cause he would pull down, than to sustain that which he says is so near to his heart. But I expect the old retort—"You were born in sin, and do you instruct us?" But neither the Trojans nor Agamemnon would believe the predictions of Priam's daughter. Cato, when a very old man, learned Greek; but all history affords no instance of an old man becoming prudent after he had filled up his threescore years and ten.

EDITOR.

## EDUCATION—*No. I.*

BEING PART OF AN ADDRESS FROM M. M. CARROLL, ON THE SUBJECT OF EDUCATION.

### PUBLIC INFANT SCHOOLS.

I SHALL, previous to closing these remarks, propose a plan for your consideration, which will, in a great measure, though not, perhaps, entirely, meet the difficulty in question: it is a system of infant instruction. Statesmen have strangely overlooked the subject of early culture as it stands connected with political economy. If it be the obvious interest of every family to have their children instructed, and to train them up in the way they should go, it is no less the interest or true policy of the state, to take its sons and daughters under its fostering care, and provide the means necessary for the proper development of their intellectual and moral nature. Every child is and ought to be regarded as a component part of the state, liable to punishment if found violating the laws, but entitled at the same time to instruction and protection. There seems to be an inconsistency, and even a sort of injustice, in visiting the offender with punishment, without first placing him in a condition to distinguish fairly between right and wrong. We make ample provision for *correction*, but little for *prevention;* like an angry and cruel mother who suffers her children to grow up in neglect, and then punishes them for doing wrong. As mercy is a more endearing attribute than justice, so *prevention* is better than punishment. But the policy of governments hitherto appears to have been to provide millions for punishment, not a dollar for prevention;—a very narrow and unwise policy, and well calculated to enhance the expences of the government and increase taxation.—It is wretched economy to spend our money for the erection of prisons instead of school-houses. The interest of the sum that has been expended on the new prison in the neighborhood of our city, would afford ample means for the constant instruction of from eight to ten thousand children, on the infant school plan. What a nursery of intelligence, virtue, and usefulness would thus be provided! what blessings and ornaments to society!

Our neglected children that are suffered to run wild, exposed, to the blighting influence of corrupt associations, and to acquire the vagrant habits attendant upon idleness, form those nurseries which supply their annual crop, (with the same certainty that the leaves of the forest put forth,) to pray upon the community, and by a sort of retributive justice repay society for the neglect which they have received. There is neither wisdom nor policy, nor economy, in this course, and whilst it continues we can have no reason to expect a remarkable alteration for the better.

It is asserted that every three convicts which England sends to Botany Bay, costs her a sum sufficient to support an infant school of three hundred children for one year!

Something has already been said in this address on the importance of *beginning* aright in this matter; and the observation was made with a view to infant instruction. It is my settled conviction that no

plan you can adopt will be intrinsically valuable or efficient in its operation, until you *begin* here. You have petitioned the legislature on the all-important subject of education; you have drawn up, with much labor, care, and ability, a plan not only for the establishment of these schools, but you have also suggested the means of raising the funds for their support, in a way that must meet the approbation of every reflecting man in the state, inasmuch as it will place every citizen upon an equal footing, without compromising either his self-respect or that valuable feeling of independence, which is the proper and legitimate right of an American citizen. I say, without compromising his self-respect and that sentiment of independence which ought to be cherished by all; for I hold that charity schools, though founded and supported by the best feelings which man can boast, are not in accordance with the spirit of our constitution, the nature of the government under which we live, nor the true dignity of man.

## SYSTEM OF INSTRUCTION.

This you have done in the measures already taken; thus far it is well done; but your work is not finished: nay, if your plan were to go into operation to-morrow—if the doors of your school-houses were then to be thrown open and the children about to enter, the most important part of the work would still remain to be performed:—*I mean a proper method of instruction.* Permit me to say, that society is yet in its infancy as it regards the subject of education. And in this bold assertion I do but respond the sentiments of those whom experience has best quallfied to form a correct judgment.

Any thing deserving the name of a system of education, must be based upon a knowledge of the philosophy of the mind; its constituent faculties must be understood, their arrangement, their subordination, and the proper *order* of their development. When this is known, we can then adapt our instructions to these faculties, and an appropriate scholastic discipline be brought to bear upon each faculty in its proper place and order. To form such a system ought to be your next object; all that is known on the subject of mental philosophy, should be carefully consulted; that which has received the sanction of experience preserved; all that is fanciful rejected; and let there be a congruity between the instruction to be received and that which is to become the recipient.

It is lamentable to see the very limited attention which has been paid to the subject of mental philosophy, even by those to whom the knowledge is most necessary, and the nature of whose profession renders it a solemn duty. How few instructers are there whose investigations and researches take this direction, and who make themselves acquainted with those faculties to which their instructions are to be applied!

What would be thought of an anatomist who should attempt to instruct a class and to explain to them the arkana of the science, when, at the same time, he was himself ignorant of the constituent parts of the human body? And yet the one is not a whit more absurd

than the other! Were this matter better better understood, we should not see so many of those cards, which remind one of a bill of fare, containing from twelve to twenty different branches, obtruded annually upon the public, and which are calculated to make the judicious grieve, or excite his compassion, it is difficult to say whether most for the master or the pupil on whom they are about to be inflicted.

I know not a greater benefit a wealthy individual could confer upon the community, than that of laying the foundation of an establishment for the express and undivided purpose of teaching the philosophy of the mind, as connected with education; that what is already known of this science, but which knowledge is confined to a few, may be more generally known; and that those especially who are called to direct the minds of youth should at least become acquainted with the materials upon which they have to operate as well as the instruments with which their operations are to be performed.

The course heretofore pursued, in a few words, is this: A young man passes through a certain routine of instruction, acquires some knowledge of the dead languages, perhaps to the neglect of his own, and a few of the sciences; thus qualified, if no other employment offer, he commences a school; generally, not as a matter of choice, but of necessity; the science which of all others is the most important, he is as ignorant of as the pupil the formation of whose min and future character, are in a great measure at his disposal. This is a statement in no wise exaggerated; nay, I think many of you will be ready to acknowledge that in thousands of instances it falls far short of the truth; for it is well known that there are many teachers who do not posses even the slender qualifications above enumerated, and whose example in the important articles of morals and of gentlemanly deportment falls far short of that which a parent ought to be desirous of having presented as a pattern for his child to imitate.

## REVOLUTION IN TEACHING.

These infant schools have already effected an important change in the method of imparting instruction to children. They are destined to supersede the old system entirely, and to introduce one more in accordance with the philosophy of the mind. Without entering into any tedious disquisition, it may not be out of place to observe that there are in general two faculties under which all the particular faculties which constitute the nature of man are arranged, viz. his *will* and his *understanding*. To the former belong all his affections, appetites, and feelings: to the latter all his ideas, thoughts, reflections, and reasonings. The former comes into immediate exercise—the latter is much slower in arriving at maturity.

It is the former, therefore—namely, the will, with its affections and appetites—that first claims our attention, and solicits the kind hand of an assiduous care, to guide in difficulty, to sooth in grief, and to restrain in passion. This faculty requires the more attention from the circumstance of its being the governing and ruling faculty—that which in truth constitutes the man, excites the thoughts, and to which the understanding and reason are entirely subordinate. It is here that

those good affections and feelings are stored up during the period of innocence, infancy, and childhood, which prompt to neighborly love and kindness, which stamp the future character and form the future man.

But how is this branch of education neglected both in families and in schools? Our children are treated as though they had nothing but heads to cultivate; the best and principal part of the man, the heart, is almost wholly neglected. This is the true reason why the business of education has become such a formidable task; a task so irksome both to the teacher and the pupil, instead of being, as it surely ought to be, one of the most delightful occupations on earth! a scene where love, hope, and patience ought ever to reign with mild and beneficient sway.

We do not commence at the proper place with our instructions; the great book of nature with its broad and expansive page, stands wide open, as if to solicit attention as soon as we open our eyes; our other senses, too, stand open to convey their appropriate impressions to the brain. But we set this book aside; we close it and open another made up of artificial characters and arbitrary signs. The poor infant is put to his a, b, c, as soon as he can lisp, and from thence winds his weary toilsome way through all the mazes of syllabication, until the task of reading is accomplished.

Letters is one of the noblest inventions of man, and an indispensable medium in the acquisition of knowledge; but there is a better and a readier way of accomplishing the end, a way that would substitute pleasures for irksomeness, and smiles for tears. Artificial language should not be permitted first to engage the attention of a child; it is at least four removes from the point of beginning. Thus the objects of nature are the first that address themselves to the senses—the ideas or impressions made by those objects, the second—the names affixed to each object, is the third; and the arbitrary sign which represents the object, is the fourth. Now it is absurd to begin in the fourth place instead of the first, and here lies the difficulty. Afford children an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the objects, themselves, their more obvious qualities and uses; let them acquire a habit of observation and reflection, and all that remains will become comparatively easy; you will then no longer see them like parrots, repeating words, the signification of which they do not comprehend, and which convey no specific idea to their mind; let them become familiar with the thing, and they will soon master the name.

The mind may be compared to a magnificent structure or tabernacle of three compartments: the portals are the senses; in the outer court reside the imagination and the memory; in the middle compartments are the understanding and judgment; in the sanctum sanctorum is an altar dedicated to reason and religion; the memory, the understanding, and all the intellectual powers, are the vestal virgins that minister here and supply it with a perpetual fire, a fire of a brighter and a purer flame, because kindled by love and holy affection, flowing from a renovated and grateful heart.

*Philadelphia Recorder.*

## EDUCATION—*No. II.*

THE preceding essay is not from my pen. I adopted it. Sitting down to write one upon the education of infants, and happening to lay my hands upon the "Philadelphia Recorder" of the 5th instant, and seeing the views ably sketched, which I wished to offer to my readers; I therefore adopted them. In the millennial order of society a system of education in accordance with the true philosophy of the whole man, mental and corporeal, will doubtless universally obtain. I have doubted, seriously doubted, for at least fifteen years, whether the present mode of training the human mind in common schools—whether for infants or young men—was not almost antipodes to reason, and sailing against the wind and tide of human nature. It is worse than wrong end foremost. We begin in metaphysics, and end in physics. The *natural* sciences, in the present course, are for young men, the last years of their academic, and the *unnatural* sciences (pardon the antithesis) are for infants and children! The infant schools, now in experiment, are approximating very much towards reason, or towards the philosophy of human nature. We want another class of *infant* schools for *young men.*— I made something like an experiment of this sort when superintending a classical school, in which mathematics, and what are called the natural sciences, were taught, some seven or eight years ago. It was sufficient to convince me that more than half the time spent in the collegiate way was lost, and less than half the acquisitions were made during the whole course, which might, under a rational system, be obtained at the age of from sixteen to eighteen. I rejoice to see the advances which every year is making towards that perfection of education which is necessary to the millennial order of society. But of this hereafter.

Our present order is more with the moral and religious training, than with the literary or scientific education of the infant mind. And first of all, the views of God, which are first imparted to the infant mind, claim our regard. This is the all-absorbing topic in the present essay. I have much feeling on this subject, because I have experienced the bitterness of the popular catechetical course. I was compelled to memorize almost the whole New Testament, and many passages in the Old; but along with it I had to memorize and digest the Assembly's Catechism, together with Brown's explanation of it. This required as much of my time as to acquire the rudiments of the Latin and Greek tongues. The good effects of memorizing the New Testament were neutralized by the trash which the Westminster Divines had obliged me to interlard with it. This gave a coloring and a taste to all that I learned from the Scriptures. It was the same as if the Oracles of God had been translated into the Catechism—as if the spiritual meaning of the living word was decocted into it. I need not tell again the doleful tale. I was alienated from the life of God by the very means which men had contrived to reconcile me to it. Much observation and intercourse with those indoctrinated in the same way, have convinced me that this course has been to many

others what woful experience proved it to me. It is true, I have much reason to thank the Heavenly Father that it was not to me so ruinous as it has been to some others. Many have found life insupportable under it, and sought refuge from themselves in death. Moral and religious men have become suicides under this system, carried out by their preachers and writers. Within a few years past in these vicinities a number of persons have been alienated, not only from God, but from reason, and from themselves, and have become their own murderers from this system These were not flagitious sinners. They were the most orderly members, and some of them elders, of Presbyterian and Seceder churches. A few days since I heard of two very religious men, one, if not both, elders of churches—a Robert Bovard and a John Alexander, I think, of Beaver county, Pennsylvania. The former read Dickinson on the five points until he concluded that he was a reprobate: he hung himself. John Alexander was the admirer of the same system, and reasoned himself into absolute despair. He killed himself in the closet in the most deliberate manner. These instances have occurred within the last two or three years. With a little trouble a list of such cases, of fearful extent, might be made out. No person from reading or studying the New Testament only, ever fell into despair. But yet men will not be weaned from systems which they learned from their pious mothers and fathers, notwithstanding such is and has been their tendency. *Conceit* or *despair* are the alternatives of hyper-calvinism. One conceits he was one of the elect from all eternity—he triumphs. Another despairs, because he can find no reason to assure him that he was one of the eternal favorites—he hangs, or shoots, or hardens himself for the day of slaughter.

But to return. The views of the divine character communicated to the infant mind generally alienate from the life of God. This alienation is generally ascribed to the total depravity and unbred enmity of the human heart. The natural enmity is depicted in strong colors—"conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity"—"children of wrath even as others"—"dead in trespasses and sins"—"the carnal mind is enmity against God"—"that which is born of the flesh is flesh," are quoted with great emphasis in support of the allegation, in support of the position, *that infants naturally, perfectly, and cordially hate God.* That they are fallen and so imbecile as to render such a state *possible*, few men acquainted with the Bible or human nature will deny. But that this is under the christian economy not unavoidable, is not distinctly seen by many. Christianity does what Judaism and Paganism could not do. It puts it in the power of christian parents to present a different character of the God and Father of all to the infant mind, from that which Judaism and Gentilism afforded. Let us examine this matter a little.

Can a person, old or young, love, fear, or hate a person of whom he is perfectly ignorant? I will venture to answer NO. If then a child has never heard or learned any thing of God, it cannot naturally hate him, fear him, or love him. Whether a child shall love or

hate God is *educational,* and not natural. For until taught something of God, it is affirmed (and no man in his senses will deny it) it can neither love nor hate him. Education, then, and not mere natural birth, is the cause, and the sole cause, of the love or hatred manifested by infants or children towards God. According to the picture presented to the eye, so will be the image on the retina; so according to the character of God presented to the mental eye, will be the image of God to the infant and its feelings or affections towards him. So far, we think, we stand upon a rock. And here we shall pause for an illustration.

It happened at one of the Olympic Games, that Philemon was introduced to a large assembly of Athenians convened at a public festival. So soon as Philemon was announced by a Lacedemonian, the assembly arose as they were wont to do in honor of a respectable stranger. Omricon did more—he fell upon his neck and embraced him. Philetus immediately left the room, and the assembly. Neither of them had ever before seen Philemon. The Lacedemonian who had introduced Philemon was curious to know why Omricon thus saluted the stranger, and why Philetus upon his introduction withdrew from the festival and the assembly. He was informed that the father of Omricon had been intimately acquainted with Philemon, and had given such a character of him to his son—had represented him as a paragon of all the civic virtues, as having greatly loved him, and been his well tried friend in a hundred misfortunes, and that it was to him that he was indebted for all the distinctions and honors which his fellow citizens had bestowed upon him, more than to any real merit of his own—that so soon as he saw him and recognized him, an inexpressible affection for his person impelled him to salute him as he had done. On the other hand, the father of Philetus had conceived an aversion against Philemon without any real cause; but seeing the father of Omricon distinguished and elevated above himself, and, as he supposed by the instrumentality of Philemon, he represented Philemon to his son as a misanthrope, a creature of the most unjust partialities, withal his decided enemy, and some way the cause of his humiliation and degradation. This was enough. Philemon was loved by Omricon and hated by Philetus. By all the other Athenians at the festival he was viewed with indifference.

Is it not evident to all that the character of Philemon drawn by the fathers of Omricon and Philetus, and represented to their sons, was the reason of the affection of the one and the antipathy of the other? There was no innate hostility in the one, nor predilection in the other towards the person of Philemon. Had Omicron had the character of Philemon presented to him which Philetus had, and had that character been represented as bearing upon his condition and circumstances as it did upon Philetus, he would have hated him as Philetus did. And had that character been drawn to the mind of Philetus as it was to that of Omricon, and made to bear upon his condition as it did upon that of Omricon, he would have loved Philemon as Omricon did.

We use this comparison to show that the enmity or love to God conceived in the mind of a child, depends upon the character of God drawn out and figured forth to its mind. This far, we say, and no farther, do we apply this similitude. This being conceded, (and who will not concede it?) it follows that this enmity or love is created, and not born with the child. But every child comes into the world with a susceptibility of being filled with all enmity and hatred against God. In this miserable plight it is introduced into existence. But how it shall conceive of God is in the power of the parents, or of those from whom it receives its knowledge of God. Hence it is that so many injunctions are found in both Testaments on the subject of the nurture and education of children. If, then, such a character of God can be given to a child as will be amiable in its eyes, it will love him; if not, it will be filled with enmity.

Some, like the Athenians towards Philemon, being ignorant of his character, have neither much affection for him, nor antipathy against him. So some are alienated from the life of God through ignorance of him, and others still more alienated through wicked works.

These remarks are designed to call forth the enquiries of christian parents on their duties to their children, rather than to decide any question relative to the fall and degradation of the human family, or to explore the amount of depravity and enmity which ordinarily exhibit themselves in the human heart. That children are corrupted by education, and that evil communications corrupt good manners, all see, all feel. That the minds of children are capable of being shaped after almost any model and cast into any mould, universal testimony and observation prove. Of how much consequence then is it, that parents should know the amount of formative influence which God has given them—that that influence may be wielded to the good of their offspring, and to the happiness of the human race. What arguments christianity puts into our mouths, and what powers it bestows upon us in bringing up our children in the knowledge and love of the Lord, we shall reserve for our next essay.

EDITOR.

---

*For the Millennial Harbinger.*

## REGENERATION.—No. III.

GOD is a spirit. Eternity and immortality are amongst his attributes; and glory and majesty surround the throne of the peerless Author of the Universe.

Man consists of body, soul, and spirit. By the two former he is related to matter, and to the animal creation. As it respects the latter he resembles God. Formed of the dust of the ground, possessed of appetites and passions, material and animal relations first occupy his attention. His senses, the only inlets to knowledge with which he is furnished, limited entirely to the discovery of that which is in its nature material, are altogether incompetent to detect that which is spiritual. Thus constituted, he can acquire a knowledge of those substances with which he is not acquainted, only through

the medium of the ideas originated by those things which he already knows; while his spirit, the peculiar and ennobling attribute of man, the pure and perennial source of true enjoyment, can investigate the harmonies and behold the glories of a spiritual or intellectual world only through the images afforded by that which is material.

No one ever saw God. In his own nature invisible to man, he hath condescended to reveal himself in the only manner in which our nature enables us to recognize him. He uttered his voice and the Universe sprang into existence. By the things that are made hath he clearly manifested to all who would reflect upon them, since the creation of the world, his invisible things, even his eternal power and divinity.

Having in various ways and on different occasions exhibited himself to the human family, in the latter times the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father hath made him known. The Word which was in the beginning, God, and with God, by which the worlds were made, assuming the body which had been prepared, became incarnate, and sojourned among men. God was his Father. As he resembled his mother Mary in partaking of flesh and blood—of material substance; so was he the effulgence of his Father's glory and the exact image of his substance. As the Father had life in himself, so had he given to the Son to have life in himself. Partaking of Deity, the chains of Death were incapable of retaining him. He was in the Father, and the Father in him. Commissioned by God, he has related God's own words, for the Spirit was not given by measure to him. Full of grace and truth, he exhibited to men those testimonials of the truth of his pretensions which their capacity enabled them to receive. The same divine power displayed in creation issued from his finger, accompanied his voice. Divine wisdom flowed from his lips—love and pity shone in his tears. Unlike the first Adam who was of the earth, earthy, and who could communicate nothing but animal life to his posterity; the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, was made a quickening Spirit. As the children of the earthy man bear the image of their parent in disposition as well as body; so are those who are begotten of God to have the same mind which was in Christ Jesus, and each of them shall be finally clothed with a house from heaven, fashioned like unto his glorious body.

Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ, has been begotten of God. The evidence necessary to produce such a belief was exhibited by God (who is a spirit) in Jesus Christ, who being glorified and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, communicated the gift according to measure to those men who were thus empowered to proclaim to all the world the glad tidings of the renovation of mankind; of that reign which consisted in peace, joy, and righteousness in a holy spirit; the privileges of which could only be enjoyed by those who receiving the words of Christ which were spirit and life, thus had spiritual life implanted in them—by those who received him, believing in his name, to whom he granted the

privilege of being children of God, who derive their birth not from blood, nor from the desire of the flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God. DISCIPULUS.

## THE REMOVAL OF THE INDIANS.

THE Southern politics of the "Columbian Star" do not suit the Baptists to the North any better than does the superciliousness of its Editor the genius of the christian profession. The Editor of the Star formerly cautioned the friends of slavery in the South to take good heed how they countenanced this work. Again, he stands up for the Georgians in the Indian question. But his Baptist brother editors cannot so well endure his denunciations as not to wince under his delicate touches. The Editor of the New York Baptist Repository of the 12th of May, thus mildly remonstrates against his brother Brantly:

"Our readers are no doubt aware that this disputed question, which had produced a commendable agitation of public feeling, and called forth the manly and independent expression of public sentiment, is at length decided by the Senate in favor of removing the Indians.

"The *Yeas* were 28, and the *Nays* 19—majority 9. This majority Mr. Brantly of the Columbian Star, pronounces "respectable and decided"—and we feel no disposition to dispute their claim to that appellation. But we think it due to the talents and conscientious integrity of the gentlemen who *opposed* the measure, to pronounce the minority as equally respectable and decided. We find it impossible to conceal our astonishment at the insolence which the Editor of the Star displays in his last paper, while speaking of that numerous and respectable body of his fellow-citizens who dared, during the pending of the above question, to differ from *him* in their judgment of the case. Their private sentiments and public memorials he denominates "lugubrious forebodings of self-constituted judges!" and the editorial remarks of such journalists as opposed the claims of *Georgia* to the Indian territory, he modestly calls "the formidable denunciations of petulant cotemporaries!?"

"We beg the pardon of our sarcastic and magisterial brother, for calling his conduct on this occasion "insolent"—but we cannot recall the expression.

"The true definition of the word "*petulant*," is "saucy, perverse, wanton:"—now we would ask the good sense of our readers, whether it is becoming the character of a christian, or a gentleman, to heap such railing epithets upon the conductors of twelve or twenty of the most respectable religious, literary, and political journals in the nation?? and we may ask Mr. Brantly by whose authority did *he* conduct his side of this controverted question, since all who have expressed a different view of the subject are unceremoniously rebuked as "self-constituted judges?"

I cannot but observe how consistent with himself is the editor of the Star, for the present order of things; for the removal of the Indians

from their own lands in defiance of all treaties; for "the benevolent enterprizes of the day;" and only against the circulation of the *Harbinger* in the South, because of its supposed anti-slavery character. *For* the clergy; *for* the national covenant-breaking; *for* "the benevolent enterprizes of the day;" *for* sectarianism, and only *against* disturbing the repose of the South on the subject of slavery.—Things look this way a little, it is true. But concerning the motives we dare not say a word. I might have added that there is another congruity in his course which I have not noticed. He is very much *against* his readers hearing both sides of the question. All this, however, is, on his principles, just what it ought to be.

EDITOR.

## IMPRUDENCE OF REFORMERS.

SOME of the friends of the restoration of the ancient order of things are introducing matters entirely extraneous in their pleadings for this cause. To what purpose is it to preach their views of a Millennium, or of civil government, when contending for the faith formerly delivered to the saints? In making much ado about millennial matters, do they not see that their opponents will identify their views of a Millennium with their ancient gospel and ancient order of things? and if there should be a discrepancy, or a peculiarity in their views of the latter day glory, will not their artful opponents connect the most important items of reform with said discrepancy or peculiarity, and thus endeavor to consign them together to one and the same fate? Remember Paul's resolutions in Corinth. "I determined," says he, "to make known nothing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified—declaring to you the testimony of God." Other topics at other times, but this was enough for that time and people. The ancient gospel and order of things, with the matters necessarily connected therewith, are sufficient to engross all the energies of the ablest proclaimers in the field.

EDITOR

## INJUSTICE OF ANTI-REFORMERS.

SOME anti-reformers attack our pleadings for a return to primitive christianity, through our remarks upon Bible, Missionary, and Tract Societies. If at any time they should think, or get others to think, that there is some flaw in our reasonings against these benevolent *hobbies*, then they flatter themselves and persuade their followers, that, as a matter of course, all our views upon all other topics are chimerical, wild, heterodox, or some way defective and dangerous. This is unjust. These human institutions may be supported or not by good reasoning, and still the question is undecided; nay, every other question concerning the doctrine of the Reign of Heaven is just where it was. My being wrong in saying there never was a *grey* swan, will not prove that I am in an error when I allege that there

is not in this land a *white* crow. Our opponents too often seem to proceed upon such a principle. We would wish to see them discriminate with more accuracy, and examine with more candor.

Why Mr. Clopton should solicit from Mr. Ball his notes of a speech delivered by me on christian immersion, and from the apochryphal cyphers of an unauthorized reporter, profess to give my views of immersion, when he has them from my own hand—from my own pen — I leave it to all candid gentlemen and christians to decide. To a similar arbitrament I would refer some of the Baptist Missionary Board friends, who give such representations as the Dialogue in a late Religious Herald, of some anti-missionary arguments. Why not meet the reasonings already published in vol. 1, C. B. on this subject, rather than have recourse to fireside chit-chat for documents to obtain a sham victory over an absent opponent? And what has this to do with the matters on hand? We are not now debating upon missionary affairs; and suppose our missionary friends were all in the right, and we in the wrong, how would this affect the great question concerning faith, repentance, immersion, and forgiveness of sins? Just as much as if the Catholics of Spain should argue that because one item of their faith is correct, therefore every thing which they hold and which they teach, either from the apochryphal books or the Old Testament, is indubitably true. We wish to see more honesty, sincerity, and candor displayed by all who presume to lead the people.

EDITOR.

## CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE.—*No. I.*

AT an early period of our editorial labors we had occasion to remonstrate against certain hackneyed phrases, such as "*experimental religion*" and "*christian experience.*" These canonized phrases we found were misleading the religious community and imperceptibly substituting an artificial and inoperative religion for the pure and undefiled religion of the gospel. Many of the teachers and of the taught, either misapprehending or disliking our strictures on these darling themes, supposed or represented us as opposed to every thing in religion that touched the heart, moved the feelings, or controlled the affections of men. We were traduced as the advocates of a "*head* religion," a speculative religion, and as denying even regeneration itself, because we attacked the divinity of a human religion. After seven years close inspection of the religious world, and the operation of these systems, we are only the more confirmed in the views presented in the first volume of the Christian Baptist upon this subject. To the phrases and the ideas attached to them we must still conscientiously object. But in so doing we should much regret if any sincere disciple of Jesus Christ should suppose that we opposed or disliked a religion which captivated the heart, moved the affections, purified the soul, and reformed the behaviour of its votaries. So far from it, it is because of the manifest deficiency in these respects that we object to the systems, and the *experimental religion* of the popular leaders. A

religion that fills not the conscience with peace, the heart with love, the affections with joy, the soul with hope, and the life with good works, is not worth an untimely fig. But to call the confusion, agitation, or remorse of a legally convicted sinner, or the enthusiasm of a disobedient professor, "experimental religion," or "christian experience," is only to captivate the heedless and produce false impressions upon the minds of the unsuspicious and unway auditors. To call any thing *christian experience* which transpires or is felt before a person obeys the gospel; or, in other words, before he submits to the government of Jesus Christ, appears to me as absurd as to talk of the experience of an American citizen who lives in Great Britain, and who has never been naturalized or politically regenerated, who only intends or wishes to expatriate himself and to become one of us; or to talk of the conjugal experience of an unmarried person, or of the fraternal experience of an unborn child. When an unborn child experiences fraternal feelings—when an unmarried person experiences conjugal affection—when a subject of the Autocrat of the Russias experiences the liberties of an American citizen—then may the disobedient, untrained, and unreformed legalist, the sin-convicted, gloomy, and disconsolate anchorite, the zealous devotee to religious systems and human traditions, have and enjoy *christian experience*.

To feel the heat of the Sun, we must place ourselves under its rays; to enjoy the comforts of a fire in a cold winter evening, we must approach it; and just as certain it is, that, to feel like a christian, we must first be a christian—we must come to Christ, and take his yoke upon us, before we can find rest and peace to our souls.

I have no idea of sowing wheat and reaping barley. They who sow to the Spirit will reap a spiritual harvest; and they who sow to the flesh shall reap a harvest of corruption. Neither can we conceive how a person can feel like a christian who does not act like one.—Some complain of not feeling as they could wish. Our answer to them is, 'Act as you approve, as Scripture and reason teach you, and you will feel just as you would wish. If you would rejoice in the Lord always, always obey him. If you would dwell in the presence of God, you must walk with him. And remember that he only who dwells in love, dwells in God, and God in him.'

As the apostolic writings afford no example, and sound reason furnishes no argument to require candidates for immersion to relate a christian experience before they have obeyed the gospel, we protest against the custom. To require candidates for marriage to relate conjugal experiences before they have entered upon that relation, is not more egregious than to ask candidates for immersion to narrate a "christian experience." Faith must be professed, and faith must be possessed, and faith must be obeyed, before its fruits can be felt or seen. But the instant a person puts himself under the government of the Prince of Peace he begins to feel the peace of God; and then, and not till then, does his christian experience commence.

EDITOR

## THE APPOMATTOX DECREES;
### OR,
### THE USE OF ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCILS EXHIBITED.

WHEN Error fails to assist itself in the field of discussion and fair investigation, the strong arm of ecclesiastical councils is its dernier resort. These can denounce whom they fail to confute, and they can slander whom they cannot convict.

After a preamble from the Beaver Anathema, the following decrees are signed by *Abner W. Clopton*, Clerk:—

1 "Resolved, *That it be recommended to all the churches composing this Association, to discountenance the writings of Alexander Campbell.* ABNER W. CLOPTON, *Clerk*."

This, Mr. Clopton, is a summary way of ending the controversy, and an easy way for you to gain a complete victory. A generous, high-minded opponent, armed with the weapons of *argument*, on entering the field of discussion, says, "Now you convince and refute me, or I will try and convince and refute you." Is this the course of Mr. Clopton? He proposes to write against my views, but says he will not sustain his own assertions, should they be assailed, nor reply to my defences, but he will write against them: and here is his name, and the *only* name, affixed to the decree prohibiting the reading of my defences in my own writings. On reading this, who will not exclaim, "How courageous, manly, generous, and high-minded are the advocates of the present popular traditions!" With this fearful odds we have to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. They pretend to reason against us, but their papers must not publish our replies nor defences, and they must decree that our writings be discountenanced. What conscious imbecility do they exhibit! The Philistines could approach Sampson when they had cut off his hair and put out his eyes. Children may approach a lion in a strong cage. Who fears to encounter an adversary, fettered, manacled, and gagged? If my opponents can only get the people to read their calumnies, slanders, and misrepresentations, and will neither publish my defences in their papers, nor permit the people to read mine—the victory is theirs. But will they not reflect, or do they not care, that such measures are a trophy to the cause I plead, and to me an honor, the nighest approach to martyrdom to which any man under this government can attain. Messrs. Brantly and Clopton have honored me more than all my other opponents. They are vouchers, strong vouchers for the evidence and force of truth in my writings. They fear the publication of them: and the reading of them is not to be endured, says Abner W. Clopton in the decree.

But the New Version is also prescribed:—

2. "Resolved, *That it be recommended to all the churches in this Association, not to countenance the new translation of the New Testament.*" And

3. "Resolved, *That it be recommended to all the churches in this Association, not to invite into their pulpits any Minister who holds the sentiments expressed in the Beaver Anathema.*"

If this were *my* cause I might feel aggrieved, I might murmur and complain against such treatment; but as it is, I will not—I dare not. They who oppose it are either to be commended or condemned by the Lord. I will not be blamed by him for withholding my efforts where they are proscribed. What he puts not in my power to do, I cannot feel myself condemned for not doing. I have nothing to retaliate. The injury, if it be one, is not done to me personally, and therefore I cannot personally resent it. But I am greatly mistaken if these measures will not aid the cause they are intended to impede. They resemble so much the Jewish, Pagan, and Papal expedients to retard the gospel, that it appears to me they must share the same fate with them. I must, however, remark, that it seems to me that Regular Baptists' ecclesiastical councils, called "Associations," in issuing such decrees act more unjustly than any other ecclesiastical tribunals on earth; that more unrighteous ecclesiastical courts do not assemble than Regular Baptits ecclesiastical councils. All ecclesiastical councils in christendom, not excluding the Roman Catholics themselves, give every person a trial whom they presume to condemn.—The accused is allowed to make his defence before his accusers, and (excepting the Spanish Inquisition) no person is condemned upon mere rumor. The Beaver and Appomattox Associations have condemned upon rumor, and have never permitted, summoned, nor invited the accused to defend themselves. What do the members of Appomattox know of the new version of the New Testament, and how many of them know any thing about my sentiments or writings from my own lips or pen? *Not one in ten who vote upon such matters.* To them it is all rumor. They are complete tools in the hands of a few designing men. Abner W. Clopton could have any decree passed he wished when the jury is packed to his mind. From such courts I view an anathema as more ridiculous, or malicious, or unjust, than a papal *bull*; and though not so potent in mischief as unchristian, being equally without the forms, as well as without the reality of impartiality and humanity.

I presume nothing in the history of the world has been more undeviatingly uniform than the opposition of church courts to the spread of evangelical and liberal principles. They act as though they apprehended their own destruction in every effort to liberate the mind, and as if they feared nothing so much as an inquisitive spirit. The proscribing spirit never yet was found on the side of truth. All the renowned Associations of ecclesiastics in the annals of time have built up the cause of the priesthood against the people; and no instance on record of one of them turning out in favor of reform, so long as the people would sustain them in their errors.

Will the Editor of the Richmond "*Religious Herald*," as he published the decrees of Appomattox, be so *republican*, I do not say so *christian*, as to publish this notice of them?

EDITOR.

## PAUL'S FIRST WORK.

IN glancing over the History of Ten Churches from the pen of Elder John Taylor, we discover that he has put on record the views exhibited in our debate with W. L. M'Calla on the import of christian immersion. These sketches were written while we were in better standing with Mr. Taylor, than at this time. The old man is a little given to change, though so much opposed to it in others. I would give more extracts from this work, if it was worthy of it, or if the occasion required them. These have already been extracted by the Christian Examiner. The import of christian immersion, as exhibited in that debate and in the Christian Baptist, is considered our greatest error. *Into this John Taylor has fallen.* Ere long we shall present this matter in a new form to our readers. If christian immersion does not convey, sign, and seal to us, through faith in the blood of Jesus, the forgiveness of all previous sins, it has no meaning; nor is the christian scriptures intelligible to mortal man. But of this more clearly and fully in a few weeks. Elder John Taylor is, with us, in the most heterodox of our sentiments. *Ed. M. H.*

---

"ARISE and be baptized, and wash away thy sins. This text is recorded in Acts xxii. 16, on which a very short comment will be given. Saul's conversion is stated three times in this book, as in 9th and 26 h chapters, so also in this: The malice of this mighty sinner, is fully expressed in first of the 9th chapter, for while breathing out threatnings against the disciples of Christ, being exceeding mad, he goes with great eagerness to the high priest, desiring letters of commission from him, to go to Damascus, a distant city, and drag to Jerusalem both men and women (who called on the Lord Jesus) and treat them as he had done Stephen a little before. The whole circumstance of his conversion and call to the ministry is made explicit in these three chapters when he literally saw the Just One, (the glorified humanity of the Son of God) the brightness was so great, it took away his natural eye sight for a season—he trembling on the ground, inquired, (Lord what wilt thou have me to do?) the answer was, Arise, go to the city, and it shall be told thee what thou shalt do, 6th verse. That Saul was converted, before he rose from the ground, or went to the city, we have no doubt—and we have as little doubt, that the guilt of his sin was not removed, till he was baptized. I have heard many questions and answers, and preachings on the meaning of the above text—I think I have seen one printed sermon on the text, and the construction of the whole has been, the sin of omission was washed away; and though Doctor Gill somewhat differs from the above meaning, I have been still left in the dark. How could Saul omit a duty till he was commanded to do it? for where no law is there can be no transgression! Moreover, it is not sin in the singular, but sins in the plural, that is said to be washed away. The Lord's own time is the right time to do his own work; when Saul asks, What wilt thou have me to do? why did not the Lord tell him, Be baptized, for he was as worthy of it then as he was three days afterwards—but God chose he should labor under a sense of his guilt, 'till the moment he was first under the water, for I presume he was buried with Christ in baptism; for if sprinkling or pouring would have done, he might have sat or lay where he was, and though his eyes were miraculously opened, that he should see his way to go to the water, his guilt was not removed 'till he was baptized; neither did he partake of any sustenance 'till after he was baptized, though he had neither eat nor drank, or seen one object with his natural eyes for three days; continuing incessant in prayer 'till Ananias came to him; neither is this all the instsnces in which great things (under God) have been done by gospel bap-

tism; as in case of John's baptism in the third chapter of Matthow: (for this is call gospel baptism, for they were baptized of him in Jordan confessing their sins. This is all we know of, that they did say, though he did say to them in Acts xix. that they should believe on him; as also on the day of Pentecost, 2d of Acts, when they cry out, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Peter's answer was, repent and be baptized—every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

"Though we believe nothing can radically remove the guilt of a man's soul but the blood of Christ, yet this blood may be applied by the instrumentality of baptism, and through which the comforts of the Holy Ghost may and often do flow. Should it be said, this is placing a little to much stress on baptism; the answer would be, God has connected salvation with baptism, as also with prayer; so that for a person to profess hope in Christ, and be indifferent about baptism, is to me a very dark mark of his discipleship. I consider it a first, and greatest duty of a believer in Christ; hence we can account for three thousand being added by baptism to the church in one day—and that the first day they believed, the relation of their experiences must have been very short, perhaps only to confess their sins, and say, Baptize us in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of them, that we may receive the comforts of the Holy Ghost, or, as the blessed Eunuch here says, Here is water, O do not hinder me from being baptized! See what a heavenly hurry Saul was in, though weakened down by a distressing fast; behold him with great weakness of body, and load of his guilt staggering along to the water. I almost fancy that I see the dear little man—(he was afterwards called Paul, which signifies little,)—hanging on the shoulder of Ananias, and hurrying him up with his right arm round him; and as they walked on, saying, Be of good cheer, brother Saul; when you are baptized, your sins, or the guilt of them, shall be washed away. And it may be that the Lord Jesus, in his all-governing providence, directed him to the street, which was called Straight, and to the house of Judas, water being at hand there. I am far from believing that water (even instrumentally) is made subservient to the washing away of sins, or the removal of guilt, only under God's own arrangement, and never without regard to the blood of Christ. Saul's was a very peculiar case—and yet I have known baptism, in many instances marvellously efficacious, in the comfort of poor limited believers in Christ."

## THE WORD.

IN a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only I have reason to believe. This I will profess. According to this I will live, and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly lose my life, should any take it from me. Propose me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe or no, and seem it ever so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this; God has said so, therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judgment from him, neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse Christian; I will love no man less for differing in opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others, I expect from them again. I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore men ought not to require any more of any man than this, to believe the Scriptures to be God's word, to endeavor to find the true sense of it, and live according to it. *Chillingworth.*

BLOOMFIELD, *Ky.* May 27, 1830.

*Brother Campbell,*

YOUR third number of the *Millennial Harbinger* was received in due time. From various nameless causes I have till now been prevented from sending you my first objection to your writings. But before I present my objection, I will name a mistake or two into which I think you have inadvertently fallen.

You were certainly mistaken when you supposed me to be "too much under the control of my brother Editor and some person near Frankfort." I hold myself individually responsible for the course I have pursued in opposition to your sentiments and views in the "cause of reform." What I have said and done, you will please, hereafter, impute to my own free volition and premeditated judgment.

Tis true that brothers George Waller and Silas M. Noel have not been friendly to the sentiments advanced by you. They, with myself, have, for years, believed that your course would not terminate in manner the most to be desired. That I entertain for these brethren sentiments of esteem and christian love, is also true. Indeed, I think they deserve to be loved and honored for their work's sake; for they have faithfully labored in the vineyard of the Lord—they have planted and built up large congregations of believers—they have turned many to righteousness—and will, I hope, have a crown of rejoicing in the day of the Lord Jesus. My prayer to God is, that you and I may be found equally faithful and successful in the promulgation of the gospel. If they have opposed your course, are they therefore, to blame? Did you not first oppose the sentiments which they hold, and which, in their judgment, are of vital importance? or have you an exclusive privilege to censure the opinions, sentiments, faith, and practice, of your fellow-laborers in the Lord's vineyard? I think not.

Again, I think you are *mistaken* in the supposed authority which you derive from the example of Christ and his Apostles, of conferring upon some of your brethren the epithets applied by Christ and his Apostles, to the scribes, pharisees, false teachers, &c. The individuals concerning whom the Saviour and the twelve thus speak, were enemies to the gospel and the institutions of the Christian Dispensation. They opposed the revealed will and statutes of the King of Kings. Not so with the brethren who oppose your writings: they love and obey the laws of the King—they are his friends—his faithful and devoted servants. That a vast difference exists between your writings and the Oracles of God, needs no demonstration. What is your *Christian Baptist* but the sentiments of A. Campbell, *et cetera*, on a variety of religious subjects? It contains, as you must acknowledge, many errors—many deviations from the apostolic rule of charity. What is it but "a human contrivance"—the invention of men—an unsafe guide to religious inquiry?

To it as a mere human contrivance, as the invention of man, may I not, with propriety, urge the following objections:—

1. As "an instrument of instruction, *it cannot be relied on.*" 2. As "an instrument of instruction, *it is unsafe.*" 3. As "an instrument

of instruction, *it is unauthorized.*" 4. As "an instrument of instruction, *it has neither uniformity nor perpetuity.*"

Now if these, and many other objections equally well founded, can, with propriety, be urged against your Christian Baptist, I ask you, in the name of candor and honesty, have not the brethren deserved praise instead of censure for their opposition to your writings? Ought they not to have opposed a human invention in religion? Your Baptist is nothing, neither more nor less than a *human invention*—an invention, too, which cannot be *relied on*—which is *unsafe and unauthorized*—which has *neither perpetuity nor uniformity.* This is your own doctrine in relation to human inventions in religion—its application to your Baptist is just and unavoidable. It stands self-condemned. Why, then, should you censure your brethren for their opposition to what you must—you do confess to be unauthorized by the Lord Jesus? Why should any human being undergo a castigation for his rejection of what is *unsafe?* Come, tell me.

But not to detain you. My first objection to your writings is this: ☞*They have produced divisions in the churches of God, and are calculated to produce divisions.* That such is the tendency of your writings you and I have the most ample testimonials. You have seen with your eyes, and heard with your ears the dissensions, confusion, and distraction of the churches in Kentucky, produced by your Baptist. Instead of love, peace, joy, long suffering, gentleness, brotherly kindness, and all that adorns the churches of God; we see Discord, with her gorgon attendants, envying, strife, confusion, emulation, evil speaking, evil surmising, heresies, (*airesis*,) backbiting, clamor, and wrath. Such is the state of society in many churches in Kentucky. My heart mourns over the desolations of Zion—I am grieved for the daughter of my people. O Lord God of Israel! how long shall these things continue? Poor Baptists? they are becoming a by-word and reproach; their enemies point the finger of scorn, and say, "*See how these brethren love one another!*" Oh! my brother, if there be any bowels of mercies, any consolation in Christ; if fraternal love is yet pleasant to thee, hearken to my voice, give audience to my word: Exert with me all thy powers to heal the wounds under which the churches bleed and groan. "A soft answer turneth away wrath."

Though I have said your writings are calculated to produce divisions in the churches of God, yet I am unwilling to impute to them, as some have done, *all* the confusion, strife, and turmoil, with which the Western churches are now afflicted. Much of the present confusion I attribute to the pravity of human nature—to the want of information—to a destitution of piety and devotional feeling—to *the manner* in which your peculiarities have been opposed—and a *little* to "*Who shall be greatest?*" These, in connexion with your writings, have resulted in bitter envyings and strife in many parts of the state. Thank God, that, among the churches of the Salem Association, to which I belong, peace, harmony, and love abound. So far as I am acquainted with the brethren among us, none desire to destroy the

felicity of the saints by raising the standard of heresy, (*airesis.*) You understand my meaning.

To my objection you may, perhaps, make this reply: "'Tis true my writings have produced divisions in *the* churches of God—so it was when Christ and the Apostles first taught christianity to the world—so it was when Luther and Calvin proclaimed the word on the continent." Not quite so, my brother. The gospel is one thing—your Baptist another. The former is authorized—the latter is not. The rejection of the one ensures exclusion from heaven—to the rejection of the other no penalty is annexed. You, then, from scripture precedent, cannot plead justification.

Luther and Calvin cannot bear you out. They caused divisions in the church of Rome; *ergo*, you are authorized to sow the seeds of discord among the churches of the living God—to set the disciples of Christ at variance—to separate chief friends—to erect from the ruins, the fragments, the shipwrecked churches of the Holy One, churches after *your* ancient order of things. But if *the* truth effected the mighty reformation in the days of the European reformers, why is it that you dissent from them? Is not truth unchangeable!

Do you wish the Bible to be better understood, more loved, and less neglected than it is? So do I—so do *all* my brethren. I will venture to affirm that the great body of the Baptists have for the Bible a love and a veneration equal to yours.

How do you account for this one thing: the brethren all love the Holy Oracles; yet many do not love *your* ancient order of things? Is there not, then, a discrepancy between your order and the apostolic order? Their order was safe—yours is not.

Again, if it be maintained that the scriptures alone are *sufficient;* that they are as plain as Heaven designed they should be, why attempt elucidation? why publish to the world in an unauthorized form and manner, the ancient order of things, when the real ancient order stands forth in all its native beauty in the apostolic writings? Surely, my brother, you could not hope that the disciples would forsake the *gospel* order as laid down in the book, and follow the ancient order of your Baptist. However highly I might wish to honor you, I cannot leave the New Testament to follow you. Christ is my master—I call no man master. You will therefore consider my preference for the New Testament no dereliction from the strictest rules of charity.

To sum up the whole matter, let me ask, Is it not shameful, and injurious for the churches of the Redeemer to engage in a civil war with each other on account of your *opinions?* Before the publication of your opinions peace generally reigned. Bishops who *now* bite and devour each other, then lived in peace, labored pleasantly together in the harvest of the Lord, or, as soldiers, they fought the common enemy. But now they present the spectacle of another Gaul to lure the ambition of another Cesar. A kingdom divided against itself cannot stand. I consider the Baptist churches as the kingdom of God—by their own dissentions, it is feared, they will destroy themselves.

SPENCER CLACK.

## REPLY TO SPENCER CLACK.

*Brother Clack,*

WHETHER your communication, a moiety of which only I have had room to insert in this number, be such as was to have been expected from your first letter, I shall leave others to judge. For my own part I feel much disappointed in the want of argument and objection in the communication as far as printed. By objection, I mean *pertinent* objection. Had I set up the Christian Baptist as *a term of communion*—had I made it an *infallible instrument* of instruction—had I claimed for it the *authority* of any part of revelation, or of even a church covenant—then you might have had some pretext for writing as you do. But unless you wished to insinuate (and charity forbids the imputation) that I was placing it upon a par with the apostolic writings, I can with difficulty imagine what motive governed you in proving that it is not the Bible. If you had written an essay to prove that Jerusalem was not Babylon, or that a square was not a circle, I could have discovered as much pertinency in it as in the greater part of the communication before me. This remark disposes of all the objections save one, indicated in the pages published.

Your encomiums on Messrs. Waller and Noel are no doubt sincere, and as a proof of your affection for them, and high opinion of them, it was quite expedient for you to make this work the medium of their publication. Concerning these gentlemen, neither their labors nor their success, apart from other considerations, pass with me for any thing. I could mention some *living men* who were as renowned for success as either of them, whom few now suppose to be eminent christians. I make not this remark to their discredit, but as a caution to you in judging of men from some accidental circumstances; and as a reason why I cannot thank you for praying that I may be found equally faithful and useful as they. I cannot object to your praying that you may be as faithful and as useful as they; for you are a much better judge of your own faithfulness and usefulness than I can be, and you may have a right to set up for yourself in your prayers a standard which may not be equally acceptable to others. Brother Clack, when you think me worthy of being named in your prayers, pray that I may stand perfect and complete in the will of God, and that I may be a follower of the Holy Apostles as they followed Christ

I never censured any man for opposing my course. It is for the *manner* in which those persons have done it. And I think you have the means of knowing that I was traduced by one or both of these exemplary christians before I ever named them in my paper. It was for their alleged departures from the law of Christ that I called them to account. Who was it under various signatures, in your paper, that abused me, nicknamed me, and imputed to me sentiments and practices which I abhorred! I have some of these papers yet on file. I need not tell you that some of them, and the most scurrilous too, are imputed to Dr. Noel.

In what temper of mind, or from what sportive fancy, you ask me, "Have not the brethren deserved praise instead of censure for opposing my writings?" I do not conjecture. It is so farcical I will let it pass. Your calling my Baptist a human invention in religion is certainly a *catachresis*, a perfect abuse of speech. Is every book, and every sermon, and every conversation about religion, a human invention *in* religion. If this be your mode of reasoning—if this be the latitude and longitude of your intellection—I despair of rendering you any service whatever.

These remarks bring me on to your first formal and emphatic objection: '*My writings have produced, and are calculated to produce, divisions in the churches of God.*' This is your great and capital objection; I will therefore attend to it with all seriousness. This objection lies against every sermon you have pronounced and against every paragraph in your paper, and against every Protestant and Catholic book, pamphlet, and tract in christendom, according to the most common acceptation of the phrase "*churches of God*"—all, all tend to make divisions in the nominal church of God. Your writings about creeds, and the creeds themselves—about baptism—your preaching up grace, and faith, and works—every thing tends to make divisions in the church of God according to the fashionable import of that phrase; and as you have not defined it, I am authorized to take it in the most fashionable and usual acceptation. There is the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist church of God, and every word spoken or written in favor of any one of these, is calculated to make divisions or to keep up divisions in the church of God. And mind what follows, brother Clack: it is just as sinful to keep up divisions as to originate them. He that separates husband and wife, and he that studies and labors to keep them apart, are, if not in the order of time, in the order of crime, equally guilty. The Presbyterians, Methodists, and many other sects call the Jewish polity "*the church of God*," and from that consideration plead for infant baptism. Now this their "church of God" was divided by the preaching of John the Immerser, Jesus, and all his disciples.

It is a morbid, ricketty conscience, which is excited only because of divisions in Baptist churches. I presume you contend for what is called "close communion," and yet you believe in the regeneration of those you exclude from your peculiar "*church of God.*" This may be all well enough on your principles; but is it not somewhat eccentric for you to be so squeamish upon the tendency of the Christian Baptist, when your whole life and labors directly tend to keep up divisions? And with regard to a division in the Baptist sect I am guiltless. 'Tis those who plead for church creeds and covenants that make divisions in the Baptist church. The direct tendency of every such instrument, as all christendom is compelled lo acknowledge, is either to make or keep up divisions.

Accuse not the Christian Baptist for tending to divisions. It has less tendency that way than any religious work I have read. Is it not the most tolerant and liberal in its views? Does it not lay the least

emphasis on opinions and on agreement in opinion of any work you can mention! "*Poor Baptists!*" you say—and I say *poor Baptists* too; how your leaders break you to pieces! how they sow discord! how they publish anathemas and bulls of excommunication! how fierce and headstrong are they who issue inhibitory decrees, shut up meeting houses, and denounce what they never read, and what they do not understand!

Blame me for endeavoring to recommend and enforce the reading of the scriptures—for opposing the moonshine speculations of mystic teachers—blame me for extolling the perfection, simplicity, intelligibility of the New Testament—blame me for simplifying the christian profession. To this I do plead guilty; but you might as consistently blame moral evil upon the fountain of all good, as blame light for creating divisions. Have not the increase and dissemination of light always been accompanied with divisions?

You can excuse the Apostles, the first promulgers of the faith, Luther and Calvin, for creating divisions and giving rise to contentions, swords, and fightings; but you can find no excuse for me! Brother Clack, I know you have the spiritual jaundice, not incurably I hope; but your symptoms are decisive. You assume too much: you call every Baptist congregation a church of the living God. I cannot assent to this. I call no society who meets once-a-month only, as a church, to hear a sermon and attend in the usual way to something called "*business*"—I call no such fraternity a church of the living God. Christians they may be; but a christian church they are not. The Lord threatened to unchurch several congregations in Asia, who were models of perfection in comparison of many of these you call *churches of the living God.* But remember I am now descanting upon your assumption, and not upon the right to divide. I am for building all the disciples upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ the chief corner. Have any of the reformers passed decrees, shut up meeting-houses, published anathemas, excommunicated churches? You talk of *my* ancient order of things as if *you* had an ancient order of things of your own. You would insinuate that I have no more scripture warrant for the items of christian worship in christian assemblies on the first day of the week, than you have for text preaching and expounding, or for monthly communion, &c. You will call this *my opinion!* In this way you expect to shear me of any more scripture authority for celebrating the resurrection and death of Jesus once-a-week, than you have for semi-annual sacraments. ☞I understand you! The invidious questions you ask me about how much I love, and how much the Baptists love the Bible, are all of the same cast. "The brethren all love the Holy Oracles, yet many do not love *your* ancient order of things." This also requires a little proof. All the brethren who are acquainted with the New Testament are for the ancient order of things. I have no ancient order of things. What the Apostles say I am willing to hear and do. If you are of the same mind, then the question is, *What do they say?* To this question I will always lend a willing ear; and here I chal-

lenge all who say they love the Apostles' testimony as *well* or *more* than I, to show they do by *doing* the things the Apostles teach. We must love in *deed* as well as in *word*. You talk much about my order of things as different from that of the Apostles. You would lead us to think that you are the ancient order man, and that I am not. Be it so. I call upon you to show a single item in your ancient order of things named by the Apostles to which I object. Only name the article. I will follow you in following them.

Some of your objections are to me apparently quite of the ludicrous cast. You ask me, Why publish to the world, in an unauthorized form and manner, the ancient order of things? If this came from some other quarter I could find a better way of explaining it. "However highly I might wish to honor you, I cannot leave the New Testament to follow you!" This is a little in the laughing mood. Who ever asked you thus to honor me? What is the item in the New Testament I asked you to leave behind you? As pertinently you might have said 'Excuse me, brother Campbell; I love you, but I cannot give you my farm or my house.' Who asked for it?

Brother Clack, I do not expect that you can profit me nor the public by any thing you write in the spirit of cavil, insinuation, or reproof. You have abounded in insinuation in the paragraphs which I have reviewed. You would have it that I have castigated your good brothers Noel and Waller because "they oppose what is unsafe." You would now *saint* them or make martyrs of them. I know it is natural enough. Fellow-soldiers, whether victorious or vanquished, who have fought side by side, have a fellow-feeling for one another. You and they did your best to keep the people in the same darkness in which you found them. Had you succeeded in your opposition to me, you would not have deigned me a letter nor a reply. You might have had peace and quietness in your churches. I know of nothing so conducive to peace and quietness as darkness and death. Hence a graveyard is the most peaceful spot in the world. I cannot give you the least credit nor praise for your course in the campaign. I know you were opposing you knew not what; and I am sure that had you and Messrs. Waller and Noel pursued a different course, the divisions of which you so bitterly complain would not have existed.

Had you or they given me a patient hearing, and heard me out before you agreed to oppose the cause which I plead, I could have had a much better opinion of you and them as sincere and prudent men—as lovers of peace, union, and harmony. But no, they gave the alarm. I did not do them homage as teachers; nay, if the brethren hearkened unto me, they feared they would worship them no longer. Hence the war song was sung—the war dance got up—and the busy note of preparation was heard. It would not do to say they opposed me, because if the people regarded me they would not honor them as they had been wont to do. No: this would never do. Zeal for truth and opposition to damnable heresy, would sustain them before the people; and if they could only flatter themselves that I was in one error, their consciences would justify them in going all lengths in opposing me. I

saw this, felt this, and lamented over this, before the campaign was begun. I could have wished it had fallen into other hands; but it became my duty to go forward; and they, unfortunately for themselves, more than for the cause which must triumph, mistook the path of *wisdom* and *honor*.

And, brother Clack, only read the *Baptist Chronicle*, and say, was there ever a more puny, ill-natured, wrathful, acrimonious, and vulgar little paper published, having the word "Baptist" upon it, than this same Georgetown Baptist Chronicle? Alas! for the poor Baptists! "How are the weapons of war perished!" Is it true, as reported, that the Rabbis advised Elder Taylor to write, and chose a lawyer to chronicle the events of the crusade against reform? Instruments they are. Ministers of God they may be; for God's ministers are so numerous as to include those of vengeance as well as those of mercy. An Attilla, a Cyrus, and a Paul are sometimes found among God's ministers. You had better, brother Clack, if you have any influence with your friends, Noel, Waller, and Dillard, throw a little oil upon their troubled sea, and get them into calmer waters. They are determined to divide the "*poor Baptists!*" They will cast out some twenty or thirty preachers of the ancient gospel—and what then? An endless strife, envy, evil speaking, detraction, until the excluded take the whole country; and this they will do, just as certain as the waters descend the Ohio, if the excluded betray not the Lord's cause. I beseech you, brother Clack, until you hear from me again, exert every nerve to keep these headstrong brethren from breaking up not only churches, but Associations.

You may also whisper into their ear, that there is a charm and a power in the ancient gospel which they know not of. It is only beginning to be proclaimed in Kentucky yet. It is producing wonders. Churches are springing up like the corn all over the country by its influences. It loosens the tongues of the dumb, and turns out preachers in scores. Believe me, brother Clack, that you Kentucky folks have no idea of what you oppose in opposing the ancient gospel. Its preachers will come upon you like a torrent from the mountain, and unless your preachers repent, they will all be stricken dumb. In some parts of the country they can now only speak to a few old men and women, whose minds are indented with every protuberance in the system. The young and rising generation will as soon drink lukewarm water as hear a humming textuary lilt over his experience and quote from Gill and Fuller. EDITOR.

## ABNER W. CLOPTON'S NO. II.

*On the Preface of vol.* 1, *C. B. appeared under date of* 29*th May.*

THIS essay is as spiritless, as vapid, and as impotent as the preceding. Before he makes an extract from the Preface, he tells the story of some wandering knight of English grammar, who preached and lectured in some town of North Carolina. After informing the readers of the Star to the middle of his second column upon matters and things concerning this preaching grammarian, whose divinity and grammar appeared to be no better than other preachers', though sold for much less by the sermon, he comes to the preface and cites the follow

ing words:—"In this place I must cite the words of the justly celebrated Dr. George Campbell, author of the best translation of the four gospels which ever yet appeared in our language." On this period he writes more than two brevier columns of the Star, and never once denies the proposition. Had I supposed that reading men like Mr. Clopton were so little acquainted with the reputation of Dr. George Campbell's version of the four gospels, I might have produced some testimonials, and not have taken it for granted that every person knew it. I think there are few literary persons who would ask me to adduce testimonials in support of this proposition. But as Mr. Clopton is so illy informed on this subject, I will just say to him, that so just, so correct, so philosophic, and so classic are the criticisms of Dr. George Campbell on the whole text of the four gospels, that even the *dictionaries*, since 1782, have been new-modelled, corrected, and altered according to Dr. Campbell's *norma interpretendi*. Even Parkhurst, in publishing his second edition of his Greek and English Dictionary of the whole New Testament, acknowledges that errors in his former edition were expunged, and many renderings altered on the authority of Doctor George Campbell, Michaelis, and Pearce. Doddridge and Macknight are also adduced by him in support of his translations. But Campbell stands unrivalled amongst the authors cited by Parkhurst. How high must be the reputation of a critic in the literary world when even lexicographers new-modify their dictionaries according to his versions and criticisms! This is true of Parkhurst, whose praise is in all the schools, and especially among the *Divines*. For the reputation of Macknight and Doddridge as critics, both inferior to Dr. Campbell, see all the commentaries since published, particularly that of Thomas Scott, who speaks for the English clergy. But when any person of literary attainments attacks this version, and presents his criticism, it will be time enough to attempt its defence. This Mr. Clopton does not yet pretend to do. He only shows how much pleasure it would give him if he could do such a thing—if he were able to point out some defect in it.

Nothing that I have ever written or said authorizes Mr. Clopton to say what follows:—"In disclaiming the views of true religion, as held by the Baptists in general, and by those who in the main accord with them, the Christian Baptist rejects the common version of the New Testament as leading to these views." This is an accusation which a christian ought to tremble to make. To say that I disclaim the views of true religion held by the Baptists and all like them in sentiment, is uncharitable and unjust enough; but not so cruel as to say that I reject the common version because that version is favorable to those views and against mine! This I positively deny. Although I can point out hundreds of mistakes, and some of them very gross and flagrant, in the common version, I hold not a sentiment nor an item of religious faith or practice which I cannot well sustain from the common version; nor do I oppose a sentiment which I cannot disprove by it. I think it would be as well for Mr. Clopton to put himself under his Appomattox decrees, and to do to himself as he has done to others—prohibit himself from reading my writings. If he can read no better he had as well take the benefit of his insolvent law, and put himself on the list with those who are neither to read the New Testament nor the Christian Baptist.

The next column is written upon the following extract from the preface to vol. 1, C. B. "That the conversion of the heathen to the christian religion is an object manifestly good all christians will acknowledge; but every one acquainted with the history of the means employed, and of the success attendant on the means, must know that these means have not been blessed." This he thinks he has refuted if he can only show that one soul has been converted by all the missionaries in forty years. Be it so. One thing is plain, that if the Lord blessed the first missionaries, he has not, in any degree comparable thereunto, blessed the modern. Some error exists somewhere; for give to the warmest advocates of missionary labors all the converts made by missionaries in forty years, and make each and every one of them true and genuine converts, and the aggregate would not equal the labors of one of the first mission-

aries in a very short period of his labors. But this only by the way. After another column of declamation upon missionary means, in which reference is had to no portion of scripture, but to the common talk of the pulpits about pecuniary matters and things, next come two extracts from the notes of "the Rev. Eli Ball of Henrico, stenographer and reporter" by special grace to the Rev. Abner W. Clopton of Charlotte. These extracts are said to be the marrow and fatness of two sermons pronounced by myself in Richmond last winter, and taken down by the said Mr. Ball. Now why Mr. Ball should have given such a version of my sermon I shall not deign to inquire; but why did Mr. Clopton prefer these apochryphal notes to my written essays on the subject of immersion, I can guess. These he could manage just as he pleased, and improve as suited his object. I will, however, say this much in passing: that Mr. Ball was under promise not to publish those sermons until inspected by me; and I now assert that such extracts as Mr. Clopton has published by the special favor of Mr. Ball, were never uttered by me *in ipsissimus verbis*. This any person who only heard me speak a few words must know. They are rather a caricature of my sentiments and expressions, than my words.

Should Mr. Clopton ever present any thing in the form of an argument against any religious sentiment I have published, I will give it in full as I have done two pieces already. The last has not the semblance of reason or argument about it. It is mere declamation throughout; and I cannot think of publishing irrelevant declamation at the expense of excluding valuable correspondents, unless some great object is to be gained by it. If, however, Mr. Brantly will publish my replies to Mr. Clopton, which not only I, but even those in opposition to me say he ought to do, I will, whether argumentative or declamatory, insert his essays.

Before I close these remarks I will propose a query to the Appomattox disciples—Whether they ought not to require Mr. Clopton to desist from reading my writings; or ought the clergy to have the privilege of making laws for others to which they are not to be subject themselves? If they will answer this question satisfactorily, I may feel specially called to visit them in person. As they dare not read, perhaps they might hear me.

EDITOR.

---

*Mount Sterling, Ky. May* 15, 1830.

DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL,

YOU are no doubt much annoyed with scribblers of every description, from every part of these United States, which no doubt takes much of your time in reading them, without taking further notice of their contents. This consideration has prevented me from writing to you as often as I otherwise should have done; but the times having become much more squally than heretofore, I thought I would just give another short history of events as they exist at present among us, not fearing any consequences that may result; for I am not a candidate for any office, nor do I intend ever to be again; and therefore I shall not be liable to lose between four and five hundred dollars which the publication of my first letter to you cost me. Any thing, therefore, that I may hereafter write, which you may think worthy of notice, you may make what use of you please.

I feel greatly concerned on account of the present state of affairs in the religious world. This concern is increased from seeing those who I believe love the Saviour and love his people, arrayed against each other, as though Christ was divided and Paul was crucified for them. At our last Association, although I had refused to be sent as a messenger from our church on account of the strife that existed in that body, my name was publicly read out as a heretic in a letter from one of the churches, and an extract of the letter I wrote to you given as evidence of the fact. Not being a member of the Association, I deemed it my duty, in self-defence, to reply to the charges in writing, which the Association received and read to the great mortification of my accusers. But that

which has destroyed the happiness I once enjoyed in society, is the schism that has taken place in the church where my membership is, on account of an old written creed, as old as the church itself, called "the Church Covenant," which held forth in 11 or 12 articles the old system of John Calvin, and which a majority of the church, with brother John Smith at their head, were determined no longer to put up with; and after voting it out they asked for letters, and constituted, in less than two miles where they meet, to themselves, and have as little to do with those they left as Jews and Samaritans.

I plead with these Campbellite brethren, as they are called, to be patient, and let the old Covenant alone. I disbelieved it as much as any of them; but rather than produce a division of the church, I was willing to let it die a more lingering death; for I had no doubt but that brother Smith's preaching the ancient gospel, as he was constantly doing, would kill it without any other aid; and I thought it would be better to take the fort by siege than to risque the lives of our men; but I could not prevail, and things are as above stated. I am yet in the old camp, viewed with a jealous eye by both parties, and not very popular with either; and although my views as respects the gospel of Christ are pretty much in accordance with these reformers of yours, I am afraid to venture myself on board their boat lest they run foul of a sawyer.

I spent an evening with brother Smith lately. I told him it was in vain to profess and preach reformation unless the world could see it in practice; for if those who have professed to have got out of Babylon do not manifest more of that love and humility, and the spirit of meekness and forbearance which dwelt in the Divine Saviour than those they have left behind, they will make but little progress in doing good; and this temper and spirit I am afraid are much needed among them. The war seems at present to be waxing very hot, and I think this Summer the great battle will be fought, which will drive every one to his proper standard. The North District Association has already had a swarm out of her hive. A foxy old man, who has long been Clerk to that body, and had possession of her papers and records, has lately took it into his head to call a council of such churches as he thought would favor his designs, seven of whom attended by their letter and messengers. These have, according to his designs, advised him to keep possession of the records of North District, and have appointed an Association to meet on the fourth Saturday in next month, and have invited all the churches or parts of North District Association that favor their designs, to meet them, and they will consider themselves North District Association. I was instrumental in stopping the church at Grassy Lick from sending to their first meeting, but I am of opinion I shall not succeed in stopping them again, as a majority that your reformers left behind are of the old Calvinistic stamp, so that no doubt remains when the North District Association meets at the time and place appointed last year, their records and papers, with eight or ten churches, will be missing.

I was delighted to see your and old brother Semple's correspondence in the last Millennial Harbinger. He writes like a christian, and I love him, though I have never seen him; and whether you had patience to read it or not, if I had room on my paper I would give you some of *my* christian experience too, which would accord somewhat with brother Semple's; and then I would ask you some hard questions why and how it was that things were thus and so? But if I am not considered troublesome, perhaps I may write about it some other time. Till then believe me to be your affectionate brother,

JAMES MASON.

*Brother A. Campbell.*

---

[THE following article was inadvertently commenced in the 9th number of the "Christian Baptist;" and as it is a document worthy of much consideration, we republish the part which appeared before, that the whole may be considered together, and be entire in this work:]—

## To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.

*Dear Sir,*

IT is very possible that there have been in use among the people called Christians, for upwards of seventeen centuries, two instruments of religious instruction, very different in their origin, character, tendency, and effects.—Of these one has been devised, digested, fitted for its purpose, and transmitted to his perishing creature man, by an unerring and compassionate God. In this divine instrument there is no mistake, no misconception, no misrepresentation, no inconsistency, nothing false, nothing fictitious. In it truth, and nothing but truth, is to be found. While engaged in searching its divine contents, the honest inquirer is in no danger of imbibing error, or of swallowing falsehood. Here no poison is mixed with his spiritual food, nothing which can conduct his soul to hell, while sincerely seeking here his way to heaven. And this incomparable instrument of religious instruction is no other than revelation just as it has been arranged and worded by its unerring author, the Holy Spirit, untouched, unaltered, unmixed, uncorrupted by any debasing intermixture of human conjectures, fictions, and conceits.

The other instrument is a human contrivance, most likely first devised and introduced by the heathen orators and Jewish priests, who at a very early period embraced the religion of Christ, and corrupted it. It consists generally of some portion, more or less, of revealed truth, mixed up in a huge mass of human fables, conjectures, opinions, and fancies. In this horrid jumble of divine and human conceptions, the discordant elements are blended together in almost every possible proportion. Nor are its external forms less various than the proportions of its ingredients: sometimes it assumes the form and title of sermons, speeches, discourses, orations, arguments, lectures, commentaries, expositions, paraphrases, economies, catechisms, creeds, confessions, and whole bodies of newfangled divinity, &c. Sometimes it appears in the shape of a pamphlet, or tract of ten pages, and anon in a folio of a thousand, and in every intermediate magnitude. But, perhaps, the most astonishing fact in its astonishing history, is, that it should, however little impregnated with divine truth, or however much crammed with human falsehood. nonsense, and reverie, be termed by its inventors and patrons, *God's Word and the Gospel of Jesus Christ*, and be almost universally preferred to that *Word* and *Gospel* by a deluded, credulous, unthinking multitude, who greedily devour the pernicious fiction, and defend it with all the fury of an excited bigot.

After this general view of the nature, origin, tendency, and effects of these two instruments of religious instruction, we proceed to inquire more particularly whether that provided and sent us by God, and just as he has sent it, or that fabricated by men, and made up of the materials just mentioned, be best entitled to our confidence and employment.

First, then, God's instrument of instruction is the *only* one that can be relied on as perfectly fit for its purpose. In it we are sure that there is no deficiency to be found. Its order, its connexion, its diction, its quantity, its perspicuity, are all the work of an unerring God, and therefore must be the fittest for its intended purpose possible. Its declarations are all true, whether yet accomplished or unaccomplished. Its declarations are clear, just, and beneficent. Its motives are the most interesting and powerful that the boundless wisdom of God could make them. Its counsels, admonitions, reproofs, and threatenings, are full of wisdom, utility, and kindness; and its examples and histories are peculiarly impressive and instructive. In short, like its Divine Author, it is in all respects perfect, and therefore no change can possibly be made on it without destroying, in proportion to the magnitude of that change, its fitness to accomplish its most benevolent and important purpose—to enlighten the mind, regenerate the heart, and rectify the external conduct of mankind.

2. God's instrument of instruction is alone safe. When we resort to any human composition, written or spoken, for religious information, we are in constant and imminent danger of imbibing more or less of that soul-destroying error

from which no human production is exempt. But when we consult God's word, we are absolutely certain that we can meet with nothing dangerous there—nothing to mislead or deceive us—nothing untrue—no insidious mixture of truth and falsehood—nothing pregnant with evil tendency—no mortal poison blended with our spiritual food.

3. God's instrument of instruction is alone authorized. For the employment of any other we have neither precedent nor command within the Book of God. During the patriarchal ages we hear of no uninspired teachers, nor means of religious instructions but the inspired declaration of an unerring and omniscient God. During the Mosaic Institution, before its gross corruption after the Captivity, God employed none but his own inspired teachers, nor means of religious information but his own inspired word. The Prophets who addressed the people in the name of Jehovah, delivered his messages in the very words in which they were communicated to them by the inspiring Spirit; and the Priests and Levites who were constituted the national instructers in conformity to God's express command, (see Deut. xxxi. 11—28.) read for their instruction the written law in the hearing of all Israel. Josiah pursues the same prescribed mode of instruction, (2 Kings xxiii. 3.) and Ezra follows in his steps, (Nehem. iii. 3—8.) translating the original Hebrew, which few of his hearers understood, into Chaldee, which, from their long residence at Babylon, had become in a manner their vernacular tongue; and we find the same mode of instruction still in use among the Jews, and among Christians even in the time of Christ and his Apostles, (Acts xv. 21. xiii. 15. Ephes. iii. 4. Col. iv. 16. 1 Thess. v. 17. Rev. i. 3.) although after the Captivity uninspired men had arrogated to themselves the honor, functions, and authority of God's inspired instructers, and employed their own crude, pernicious, and unauthorized institutions and notions for the edification of the people, a fatal innovation to the Jewish nation; for their uninspired teachers, presuming to comment on and explain the passages of scripture that related to the Messiah's person, character, and kingdom, mistook their meaning, deceived and misled the ignorant multitude, and by inducing them to form false notions of his character and office, led them to reject him when he appeared among them. (From this awful fact let commentators, expositors, explainers—in short, intermeddlers with God's word, of every name, receive warning, and learn modesty and wisdom.) Nor under his new institution did God entrust the religious instruction of his perishing creatures to any but men rendered infallible by the gifts of his Spirit, till he had caused an inspired system of religious information to be committed to writing, and so rendered permanent, uniform, and transmissible to all parts of the world and to all generations of men—a device by which, as we shall soon see, the continuance of immediately inspired instructers became unnecessary. As, then, we have no precedent to authorize us to employ any other instrument of religious instruction than that which God has himself directly furnished us—so we have no command. He whom God commissions to teach speaks or relates God's own words, *not man's*—John iii. 34. and men are every where commanded to read, meditate, and search the *scriptures*, hear what the *Spirit* says to them, and earnestly desire the *unadulterated* milk of God's word; but no where, to the best of my knowledge, are they commanded to listen to the speeches or read the writings of *uninspired* mortals, in order to gain religious knowledge. This seems to be entirely a human invention, and a most dangerous one.

4. God's instrument secures to inspired instruction both perpetuity and uniformity. By this glorious contrivance the instruction offered to God's ignorant creatures, is, in respect of certainty and substance, the same in all places, and at all times. To past generations it has spoken the same inspired language and presented the same inspired ideas which it addresses and exhibits to the present race, and to future generations it will present no variation. Like its unchangeable Author, it is the same to-day, yesterday, and forever. Here the never-changing nature of God shines forth in all its unclouded majesty. How unlike that discordant and ever-changing instrument of religious instruction invented by men!

5. It displays the uniformity of the divine conduct towards all God's rational offspring. The great Common Parent has not allowed to one portion of his human family all the certainty of inspired instruction, and the advantages of inspired instructers, and to another all the uncertainty of uninspired harangues and all the danger which necessarily attends the employment of uninspired teachers. No, he feeds the first rational production of his wisdom, power, and goodness upon earth, with the same inspired intellectual food which he provides, prepares, and presents to the last men of the race, and to every intermediate member. He commands not his children to sit down at tables so different, and partake of nourishment so very dissimilar as inspired and uninspired instruction is. But with the same inspired knowledge of himself, the only true God, and of Jesus Christ, his glorious commissioner to our guilty and ruined race, he uniformly offers to feed and feast, delight and ravish every member of it. In his instrument of instruction are no different, conflicting, confounding, separating, and dividing creeds, confessions, formulas of worship, or terms of communion; no different catechisms, sermons, commentaries, expositions, or blotted bodies of human divinity; no different marks externally imposed on Christ's property, nor different elements required in the constitution of a christian. These motley, incongruous, discordant inventions are left to decorate and commend the instrument of religious instruction contrived by *bungling* man.

6. It qualifies, or rather puts it in the power of the *saints* to execute the office and discharge the great and difficult trust devolved on them. Dan. vii. 18. 22. Ephes. iv. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 2. From these passages it is manifest that the saints are charged with the work or labor called *the service* and the *building up* of the body of Christ, which language figuratively denotes the further instruction of converts already made, and the augmentation of their number. Now who are the *saints* and faithful men on whom this great, important, and honorable labor is devolved? Are they not the human beings who, through the operation of the Divine Word and Spirit on their minds, have set themselves apart to the service of their God? And is not every believer equally a member of the blessed society—equally entitled to all its privileges, and equally bound to perform all its duties? Has Christ made odious and offensive distinctions among his friends? Is not each dear and acceptable to him in proportion to the zeal which he manifests in his Master's service? Is Christ's family the theatre of senseless and unjust favoritism? Has he conferred any privilege or imposed any duty on one believer, which he has not conferred and imposed on all? I speak now of ordinary believers, not of inspired or gifted men, whose offices were arranged according to the gifts which they had received, and by which they were immediately and infallibly qualified for the performance of the several extraordinary functions which the prosperity of the Christian community in its infant state required. But if the privileges and duties of all uninspired believers be the same in kind, then it follows as a necessary consequence that a share, proportioned to ability and opportunity, of the work called *the service* and *the edification of the body of Christ*, is assigned to every believer; and every believer is of course not only authorized, but bound to perform it, whether the work to be done be of a private or of a public nature. But as God never imposes a duty or requires an action to be done without furnishing the means for its performance, he must have provided *every one* of his agents, or faithful men, with an instrument perfectly sufficient to enable him to perform the work assigned him; and this instrument we discover to be God's word, just as he has arranged and worded it, without any human addition, diminution, or alteration whatever. By the use of this inspired instrument, every saint or believer is enabled to become, not only *a teacher*, but in reality an *inspired teacher*, just as certainly as Paul or Peter ever was; inasmuch as in his attempts to instruct, he employs the very same inspired words or doctrine which the Apostles employed in theirs. Yes, every person who, in his attempts to impart religious information to his fellow-creatures, interlards no words, no notions of his own, but employs the inspired words of sacred writ alone for the accomplishment of his

object, is, to all intents and purposes, an inspired teacher; but no sooner does he abandon the words of sacred writ, or intermix them with words and thoughts of his own, than he forfeits all claim to the high, distinguished, and honorable appellation of an *inspired* teacher, and sinks into an uninspired fallacious babbler, in whose motley jumble of divine and human notions no confidence can, with safety, be reposed. PHILALETHES.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

---

THE following is from the *"Journal of Health,"* a work in my estimation of very great utility, and possessing so much merit as to have strong claims on every house keeper and head of a family, for $1,25 per annum, for his own good, and that of his children, and domestics. It is an octavo of 16 pages, issued twice a month, making a volume of 384 pages per annum, for $1,25. It is edited by an association of physicians—Agent, Judah Dobson, No. 108, Chesnut street, Philadelphia. We will occasionally furnish an extract from it; but not as a substitute for taking the work. As a philanthropist I recommend it. *Ed. M. H.*

## THE FOUR GREAT SOURCES OF HEALTH.

One of the most pleasing of our duties is, to be able to direct into our own channel, and thereby circulate widely through the land, what we know to be wise counsel; as is our good fortune to do upon the present occasion, by laying before our readers the following chapter from a valuable work, entitled, "Simplicity of Health."

"The preservation of health mainly depends on early rising, temperance in eating and drinking, exercise, and cleanliness.

"These important advantages are distributed between the rich and the poor in a tolerably fair proportion, which accounts for the apparent equability in length of life between one and the other. The poor have early rising, which is of the very first consequence, and of which I shall speak hereafter more fully. From this the rich are almost excluded, because they have no obligation to compel them, and because they go to bed too late.

"The humble and often scanty diet of the poor, which they so much deplore, is yet of advantage to their health. True it is that, as they work hard, they could bear more substantial diet than they can generally procure. But luxurious living is very prejudicial; it vitiates the blood and humors, and lays the foundation of numerous complaints. From not being able to afford suppers, the poor enjoy sound rest, the want of which is so much complained of by the rich. But the poor injure themselves materially by intoxication, and that with drink of an inferior and hurtful quality. It is certain that every fit of drunkenness has its share in the shortening of life; for, however we may find men to whom it appears to do no injury, nothing is more reasonable than to conclude, that they would live longer by avoiding inebriation. Amongst the better classes, this vice has happily, for many years past, been gradually declining: and it is now a great reproach to gentlemen to be seen drunk. But they use rich wines, *liqueres*, and spirits, of which, at their numerous meals, without getting tipsy or drunk, they take too much altogether. They likewise eat much more than is necessary or proper, and that generally of things so

artificially prepared, that the simple qualities are lost, and may almost be considered as a medicine instead of natural food.

"Of exercise, which is allowed by all as indispensable for the preservation of health, the poor have generally enough, but frequently too much; whilst, on the contrary, the rich, who, from their sumptuous living, really require more, can scarcely be said to take any. This is a heavy draught on the resources of longevity. The subject is of great importance, and will in the course of the work be treated with particular attention.

"But it is in cleanliness that the rich have indeed inappreciable advantages over the poor. The word has too extensive a meaning to be considered, under all its bearings, in this concise sketch. It will suffice here to say, that it must be taken in something more than its usual signification, personal cleanliness. In the present view, it embraces numerous comforts, domestic and personal, and many valuable conveniences, presenting important securities against injury to the health. That personal cleanliness, a thing nearly quite disregarded or unpractised by the poor, is of the greatest utility, will be hereafter fully shown; but there are other serious disadvantages to which their poverty or want of means subject them. Clothes soaked with rain, and then sitting by a fire, and being obliged, from want of changes, to wear the same damp the next day—bad shoes—humid apartments from neglected roofs, washing of clothes, and other causes —foul air, from many persons crowded into a single room. Such are a few of the consequences of the privations of the poor as to cleanliness and comforts, from which result constant coughs and colds, asthma, rheumatism, and other complaints, which would preclude them from old age, were it not for their early rising, simple diet and exercise.

—"There is much difference between the laborer in the country, and the working classes in large towns. If the former has to endure wet and hardships out of doors, he is accustomed to it from his infancy, and is descended from a hardy race; his hovel or hut, be it ever so miserable, or so crowded, has the advantage of a much purer air than the room-keeper's garret in town; he has fewer opportunities for dissipation; his food, though poor, is wholesome; his hours of meal-time are more regular, and his work is more uniformly healthful.

"The country gentleman too has advantages over his equal in town. His exercise is of a rougher and more decided cast; his food is more plain, because the confectioner, the pastry cook, and the foreign fruiterer, are not always convenient; balls, parties, and theatres, do not offer every evening; and if he drink more after dinner, he can bear it better, because his food is more substantial and simple. The balance indeed seems to be in favor of the country; and, accordingly, it is there that we mostly find instances of uncommonly extended life."

---

WE are glad to see intemperance in drinking on the wane. 'Tis a lame charity which does its work by halves. We want two or three combinations more to double our domestic comforts, and to quadruple our social enjoyments.

A combination against Rum, Brandy, Whiskey, & Co. we already have. We want a combination against *Tobacco* in the three forms of chewing, smoking, and snuffing. No one can tell how many lives this would save, how many diseases prevent, and how many comforts it would secure.

We want a combination against luxuries in general, especially of other climes, and against gay and splendid clothing. The object of this combination would be to diminish labor, to reduce the burthens of life about three hundred per cent. and to substitute reading, conversation, and refined social interviews, for the parade, and pomp, and show, which beget and cherish pride, vanity, jealousy, and foster the worst and most tyrannical passions of the human heart.

To prepare the way for a combination against *Tobacco,* we insert the following notice of its deleterious influences. *Ed. M. H.*

## TOBACCO.

It is really surprising that a single individual could be found, who, after experiencing the distressing sensations almost invariably produced by the first use of tobacco, would be willing to risk their recurrence a second time: still more so, that any one should again and again resort to the "noxious weed," until, its immediate effects being lessened by habit, it becomes an article of luxury, from the use of which it is found difficult to refrain.

The extreme nausea—pain of the head, and vertigo—the cold death-like sweat, and general exhaustion, experienced by the novice in chewing, snuffing, and smoking, we should imagine would be fully sfficient to prevent the use of tobacco from becoming a habit. Yet, such is "the folly and infatuation of the human mind," and the power of custom and example, in opposition to prudence and the dictates of nature, that one of the most disgusting productions of the vegetable kingdom, "in all places where it has come," to use the quaint expression of Sir Hans Sloane, "has much bewitched the inhabitants, from the polite European, to the barbarous Hottentot."

Did this "modern herb" possess a tithe of the virtues ascribed to it by Dr. Thorus in his *Pætologia;* did, in fact, the least benefit result to the system from its habitual use, there would then be some reason why, "with all its loathsomeness of smell and taste," it should have become so general a favorite. But we know, on the contrary, that all who habituate themselves to its use, sooner or later experience its noxious powers.

Tobacco is, in fact, an absolute poison. A very moderate quantity introducod into the system—even applying the moistened leaves over the stomach—has been known very suddenly to extinguish life. The Indians of our own countfy were well aware of its poisonous effects, and were accustomed, it is said, on certain occasions, to dip the points of their arrows in an oil obtained from the leaves, which being inserted into the flesh, occasioned sickness and fainting, or even convulsions and death.

It must be evident to every one, that the constant use of an article possessing such deleterious properties, cannot fail, at length, to influence the health of the system.

In whatever form it may be employed, a portion of the active principles of the tobacco, mixed with the saliva, invariably finds its way into the stomach, and disturbs or impairs the functions of that

organ. Hence most, if not all, of those who are accustomed to the use of tobacco, labor under dyspeptic symptoms. They experience, at intervals, a want of appetite—nausea—inordinate thirst—vertigo —pains and distension of the stomach—disagreeable sensations of the head—tremors of the limbs—disturbed sleep, and are more or less emaciated.

According to Boerhaave, "when this celebrated plant was first brought into use in Europe, it was cried up for a certain antidote to hunger; but it was soon observed, that the number of hypochondriacal and consumptive people were greatly increased by its use."

Dr. Cullen informs us that he has observed "several instances" in which the excessive use of tobacco in the form of snuff, has produced effects similar to those occurring in persons from the long continued use "of wine and opium;" that is, "loss of memory, fatuity, and other symptoms of a weakened or senile state of the nervous system, induced before the usual period."

The almost constant thirst occasioned by smoking and chewing has, in numerous instances, it is to be feared, led to the intemperate use of ardent spirits.

This thirst cannot be allayed by water; for no insipid liquor will be relished after the mouth and throat have been exposed to the stimulus of the smoke or juice of the tobacco: a desire, of course, is excited for strong drinks, which soon leads to intemperance and drunkenness.

The use of snuff destroys entirely the sense of smell, and injures materially the tone of the voice; while chewing and smoking vitiate the sense of taste. Hence those who make use of tobacco, to any extent, have certainly one, and frequently two, of the external senses, less perfect than other individuals. But this is not all. Polypus of the nose, and other serious affections have been traced to the use of snuff.

Sir John Pringle, who, we are informed, was very liberal in its use, experienced in the evening of his days, tremor of his hands, and a defect of memory. Being in company with Dr. Franklin at Paris, he was requested by the Doctor to observe that the former complaint was very common to those people of fashion who were great snuffers. Sir John was led by this remark to suspect that his tremors were occasioned by his excessive use of snuff. He therefore immediately left it off, and soon afterwards the tremor of his hands disappeared, and at the same time he recovered the perfect exercise of his retentive faculties.

Cases could be mentioned in which epilepsy, consumption, and other serious diseases have been brought on in young people by the excessive use of tobacco.

We have ourselves known individuals in whom very severe and dangerous affections of the stomach, tremors of the limbs, and great emaciation, were referrable to excessive smoking and chewing, and which were removed only after these habits were entirely relinquished. One or two of these cases, we are sorry to say, occurred in females

from the filthy practice of chewing snuff, and in a class of society where it was to be hoped a refinement of taste and exalted notions of female delicacy, would forever have precluded the introduction of so detestable and pernicious a practice.

---

*Philadelphia, May 10th,* 1830.

MR. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL,

*Dear Sir*—ALTHOUGH a stranger to you in person, I have formed some acquaintance with your writings. One object of this communication is to obtain some further information touching the translation of the Scriptures under the authority of King James.

I have been engaged in an epistolary debate with a Pedo-Baptist, a student for the ministry, on the *mode* (as it is called) of baptism; and I confess to have derived much help from reading *your* debates with Messrs. Walker and McCalla. I have asserted in my argument, that the translators were shackled by James, and received from him instructions in reference particularly to this word (baptize.) He doubts the fact, and asks for my authority, and then gives me as *his reason* of their not translating the word, that they found it difficult and impossible to express in any English word the meaning of the original; and, therefore, with great prudence and wisdom, left it as they did *others* similarly circumstanced, and merely clothed them in English characters. Now, sir, will you be good enough to give *explicit* information in reference to the above, with the authority, &c.

I wish to mention another as I am writing. Dr. Ely, Editor of the Philadelphian, has given at great length in his last number (which I presume you have seen) *fifty-five* reasons for *not becoming a Baptist!!* Now, sir, although these *reasons* are *unanswerable*, still I hope they may be noticed, and not suffered to pass by without a comment from some of our editors; for no doubt many readers will think them unanswerable—it would please me to read in your next Harbinger a *concise* and *scriptural* rebut of every enumerated reason. If you please you may give through the *same channel* the information requested concerning the translators; all which will be gratefully received by

A BAPTIST.

---

*Buckingham Court House, April 15th,* 1830.

DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL,

WE are sometimes much pained to hear reports about you which are well calculated to injure your usefulness in the cause of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. There is at this time, in full circulation, *ceteris paribus*, a report that you were, prior to your leaving Scotland, a member of the Presbyterian church, and a preacher therein: for some cause or other, was deposed; after which you left that quarter of the world (Europe) for America. Having arrived in the city of Norfolk, you applied to the Hanover Presbytery for admission or membership; but in consequence of that body having heard of what had transpired with respect to your conduct in the Scotch Kirk, refused you membership, or rather refused to admit you as a member of that body.

Dear sir, I do most sincerely and devoutly hope, that you will be good enough to give us, and to the public, an explanation of this matter; so that all may be perfectly satisfied on a subject in which we feel much concerned, and in the refutation of which we would feel the deepest interest. We know, and so do you, that much of your ministerial success depends principally upon your moral character—prior, present, and after. This renders all apologies unnecessary for writing to you on this subject. If you were once a member of the church aforesaid, and a preacher in the same, please tell to us, *multum in parvo*, your reasons for leaving it: whether that body brought against you any accusation of misdemeanor, or whether it was simply and solely because you differed with them in some of their articles of faith; and thereby brought upon your-

self the very appalling epithet of *a recta fide alienus*. There is also much said about your views respecting the Spirit. Some say you make the simple Word to be the Spirit—that the Word is the Spirit, and that the Spirit is the Word; or the Word and the Spirit in the Scriptures, mean religious feeling;—that you deny the operation of the Holy Spirit in the regeneration of a sinner—that the simple oracles in their original, native simplicity, are sufficient for all this without an impulse given immediately from God through the Holy Spirit's influence. If, sir, you hold to this, I must beg leave to differ with you; because I do most unequivocally hold to the operation of the third person in the glorious trinity, upon the heart of every individual of Adam's fallen race, who ever did, or ever shall hereafter believe to the salvation of his or her soul. If I were asked why was I made to hear the word of God aright, and enter while the offer was made to me, my answer, (and a very appropriate one too,) would be, "Even so, Father, because it seemed good in thy sight."

I wish you, sir, to give us through the *Harbinger*, a complete essay on the *modus operandi* of the Holy Spirit. This is your bounden duty. You have, by your several allusions to this subject, made it so; and beside this, we want to see some intelligible treatise from your pen on this subject, that will quell our own anxieties, and put an eternal *quietus* to all gainsaying.

I have read the two first numbers of your *Harbinger*, but could not understand all that I read. Therefore I say to you, Go on; but, if you please, let us understand you; for I have no notion of swallowing any food without pepper or salt; therefore, season your paper and its contents with plain scripture matter of fact, and we shall, and the public will be glad to receive it. When you write for us, give it to us in plain terms. Your patrons are mostly old-fashioned farmers. I will conclude by saying, Go on, αλλα θυσον τη αληθια,* and fear the frowns of none, nor regard the smiles of any.

Your friend and brother in Christ. T. M.

*Miscellaneous Remarks on Letters not directly replied to.*

BROTHER *James Mason's* letter deserves much consideration from all the *reforming* brethren. Let the reformation have its perfect work upon all its advocates. Let them remember it is not a mere reformation of sentiments or of systems, but of individual practice and behavior. *What do you more than others?* Aye, that's the question. We have, brethren, much need to take heed to this. Our enemies have good eyes—they can see thorns in our eyes which we cannot see ourselves. We are indebted to our opponents. Let us always thank them for pointing out our defects, provided they do not create any which do not exist. There is no need for this. Among the thousands who now plead for reform, there is no doubt but many defects may be seen. Let us, then, thankfully receive admonitions, however tendered.

Brother Mason was a candidate for the Senate, at the request of his friends, when I, without his knowledge, published a letter from him in which he spoke too freely of the sectaries, as they supposed. The politicians got hold of this letter, and the newspapers, aided by sectarian feeling, used it to his disadvantage, and lessened his vote so much as to issue in a contested election, which was attended with much expense and vexation. I was sorry that I should have been the occasion of such an event. But I consoled myself that one century hence brother Mason's letter would be contemplated by himself and

** Do homage to the truth.*

others as a matter of much more importance than his seat for four years in the Senate of Kentucky. "Let him know that he who converts a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins."—*James* the Apostle.

---

To the "*Baptist*" from Philadelphia I would say, Consult No. 16, vol. 1, page 302, 2d edition, C. B. for a copy of the instructions given by King James to the translators, and he will find that the King prohibited the translation of certain ecclesiastic words into English. (See the King's instructions, No. 3 and 4; also, the preface to the King's translation, which says they had "avoided on the one side the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who left the old *ecclesiastic* words and betook themselves to others, as when they put *washing* for *baptism*," &c.) This proves that they placed *baptism* among the ecclesiastic terms, and considered themselves forbidden by the King to translate it into English. (See the preface to the King's translation, as published in the Christian Baptist, vol. 7, pages 58, 85, 105, 135, 152, 198.) As to Dr. Ely's 55 *unreasonable* reasons, I have not yet leisure to notice them. I have *one* reason for being immersed which outweighs more than five hundred and fifty such reasons. It runs in *English* in these words—"He that believes and is immersed shall be saved." Or, if it be required in the form of a command, Peter gives it thus, (Acts ii. 37.) "Reform and be immersed, every one of you, for remission of your sins." I think it requires but very little sagacity to see that the Doctor's 55 *reasons* have not the semblance of a *reason* why we should not obey *God* rather than *the traditions of men*. The Doctor's 55 reasons remind me of a man who, wishing to sell a farm, gave to his neighbor forty reasons why he ought to purchase it. His neighbor heard him gravely to the end, and said, "These might or might not be good reasons; but whether or not, he had one reason why he should not purchase it." "What is it?" said his friend. "Why," replied he, "neighbor, your *title* to the farm is not worth a pin!" One good reason of this sort is worth a myriad of such sophisms as those by which the Doctor imposes upon himself and his worthy hearers.

---

Brother T. M. of Buckingham county, will see in the 5th number of this work, the calumny against me noticed, which is the prominent item in his letter. Concerning my moral character, my most bitter enemies have attested, and I am willing to abide by their testimony. I will, whenever it becomes necessary to vindicate it, go for certificates to such of them as have known me for many years—I say, my *enemies* shall attest. But I must qualify this by adding, that I do not know that I have on the continent a *personal* enemy, save one, and he is *hic, vel haec, vel hoc*, at times. But, by my enemies, I mean the enemies of the cause which I plead, and of myself for pleading it.

I cannot gratify my friend from Buckingham county with an essay on the *modus operandi* of the Holy Spirit; but I will tell him that I know of no person who does more honor to the Holy Spirit than I do.

because I contend that had it not been for its operations, I am assured that no man could say or believe that *Jesus is the Lord*. I have written nine essays on this subject in the second volume of the Christian Baptist, which my opponents generally assent to as far as the go. They blame me more for what I have *not* said, than for what I *have said*. We shall, however, attempt still farther to disinter this subject from the mysticism of the schools. See my essays on *Christian Experience*, the first in this number; also, the essays of *Discipulus on Regeneration* as they appear.

---

The Editor of the *Baptist Chronicle*, to whom I cannot speak directly, so long as he exhibits the spirit which his Chronicle breathes, gives an extract from some correspondents, (one in Mississippi and two in Cincinnati,) concerning me. I hope I will not be considered uncharitable when I say, that I have some doubts about the *authenticity* of these correspondents. They are *anonymous*, and I would require their names to be assured of their *credibility* and *authenticity*. The Cincinnati correspondents only differ 25 per cent. on my present value in that market. The one says I fell 75 per cent. and the other 50 per cent, in three weeks; in whose appreciation and in what market, he fails to inform us. Brother Clack, some months ago, it is said, announced that I had fallen 100 per cent. among the Baptists in Kentucky. I must be at this time, after such heavy depreciations, considerably below par. I am not so good a judge of these matters, it is true, as some others. But stockjobbers sometimss have an *asking* and a *selling* price; and these gentlemen have two prices for two sorts of customers. At one time the "Christian Baptist" was losing ground every where; at another, it has "a most prodigious run," and "an appalling" circulation. For the encouragement of these folks, I would inform them, that, as the Christian Baptist increased every day from its first appearance till its close, this work is marching in its steps with still more rapid strides, and bids fair even to outstrip the Christian Baptist, although it carries more weight. I would remind these speculators that "diverse weights and measures are an abomination in the sight of Heaven."

But the Mississippi correspondent gives the following report from the deathbed of the worthy Dr. Cooper. The correspondent introduces his report with the following calm and dispassionate prayer:— "May the Lord rebuke Campbell! Our brother Dr. D. Cooper, left this world in March last, and on his dying bed stated to sister Cooper, that being a constant reader, or sufficiently so, of Campbell, his opinion was, that every one who continued in that belief would come out an infidel, end requested her to tell the brethren never to let a Campbellite preach in his pulpit," &c. &c. Now this may be so; and if it were so, it only proves to me that Dr. Cooper was not of sound judgment and memory when he said so. I think, from all the information I have, that Dr. Cooper was a good man and a friend to pure religion. I have heard him well reported of for good works. Brother *Jacob Creath*, Jun. who was intimately acquainted with him, and

frequently proclaimed in his vicinity, gave me a very favorable character of him. But this correspondent comes much to the relief of the Chronicle, and as it will likely go the rounds, I deem it due to the memory of Dr. Cooper to publish the following extracts from a letter received by me from him in August last, six or seven months before his death. The Doctor did not coincide with me in every matter, but so contrary to the Chronicle's correspondent was Dr. Cooper of August last, that I cannot believe implicitly in this anonymous writer. I hope I will not be accused of egotism when giving the following extracts from Dr. Cooper's letter:—

"ELDER ALEXANDER CAMPBELL,

"*Dear Brother*—I have never had the pleasure of a personal interview with you, but have read many of the productians of your keen pen. In your *Christian Baptist* there are many things with which I am highly pleased, not merely because they are *new*, but because they are truths taught in the word of God, and in some of the principal standard works on divinity. In some material points, however, I differ with you in opinion." [He specifies my views of election as he understood them; also, some things about faith and immersion, and thus concludes:]—"I now affectionately invite you to visit our state and impart unto us some spiritual gift. I hope we shall be always open to conviction, and ready to receive the truth when we understand it. Should you find it convenient to pay us a visit, you will please make my house your home. We will welcome you in love and christian hospitality. You will find some friends and some enemies, but I trust God will open for you an effectual door. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.

"I am, dear brother, affectionately yours,

"D. COOPER.

"*Natchez, July* 15, 1829."

Since writing the above a brother from Kentucky mentioned to me that Dr. Cooper had been delirious for some time before his death; and if so, should the correspondent have heard and written as above, it must have been as I supposed above. The Chronicle will no doubt accuse me of impudence, as he has done the Editors of the *Christian Examiner*, for daring to ask Elder Vardeman for a reason for his conduct, just as if Elder Vardeman ought to have, or give a reason for it.

EDITOR.

---

BROTHER KEELING, *Editor of the Religious Herald*, IN the conclusion of some remarks on missionary operations, says, "If the Apostle Paul were on earth, he would be a hearty defender of the Bible, Tract, and Mission Cause—of Sunday Schools, and other benevolent enterprizes, that characterise this age."—Richmond, May 14, 1830.

As brother Keeling knows what Paul would do were he once more on the earth, I should like to be informed whether Paul would prefer to edit the *Columbian Star* or the *Harbinger*. I would also like to have the following questions answered: whether would Paul be President,

Secretary, or Treasurer of one or all of these benevolent enterprizes? Whether would he take a seat in the Baptist Board or Presbyterian Board of Foreign or Domestic Missions? What sort of Tracts would Paul most recommend—those written by the Methodist, Presbyterian, or Baptist Societies, or those written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? Whether would he be an advocate of the ancient or the modern order of things? As brother Keeling endorses for Paul, and the Bible, Tract, Missionary, and Sunday Schools, I will be much gratified to see him endorse for Paul in a few matters and things which bear more directly upon us. We all advocate the Bible, Tract, and Missionary cause. But this, in our version of it, is quite another matter. As I still cherish my affection unabated for brother Keeling, as did Paul for Peter when he said something about eating with the Gentiles, I do hope he will give us his reasons for Paul's conduct.

EDITOR.

---

*MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

T C Osbourne, Maysville, Ky. and S P Bacon, Nashville, Tenn. paid vol 1, by Edward Robinson to Wm. Tureman, Maysville, Ky. J Stephenson, Franklin Mills, Ohio, paid 2 dollars. E Clark, Huntsburg, Ohio, paid vol 1, by S Hunt, Esq. Mrs. Ogle, Somerset, Pa. paid vol 1. F V Sutton paid vol 1, for J Duval and Wm Anderson, Caroline county, Va. E Brazleton, New Albany, Indiana, paid vol 1. B S Hendrickson, paid vol 1 for R Scott, S Stiles, and W Stiles, Rhineback Flats, Duchess county, New York. Mrs D Bohannon, Floydsburg, Ky. paid for Edward Pierce, Simpsonville, W C Bohannon, Jefferson county, G Owen, Louisville, Eleanor M Buckner, Middletown, P B Bohannon, Floydsburg, Ky. and for herself. J H Garrard, Clay county, Ky. paid 2 dollars. P Price, Middletown, Ohio, paid vol 1. J Whitaker, Lincoln county, Ten. paid 20 dollars for subscribers, names not stated. [☞Agents will please always to forward the names.☜] Samuel M'Cleland, Wheeling, Va. paid two dollars. S Robbins, Windham, Ohio, paid vol 1. Abraham Drake, Warren, Ohio, paid vol 1. G Atkinson, Holliday's Cove, Brooke county, Va. paid vol 1. B A Hicks, paid 2 dollars for I P Robinson; also, 2 dollars for S Hicks, Fayette county, Ky. D F Newton, paid vol 1, for J P Finch, W Hall, and Elder J Fife, Goochland county, Va. Platt Stout, La Grange, Alabama, paid vol 1 for himself and Elder D B Bestor. Wm Chaffer, Hamilton, New York, paid vol 1. Dr. John R. Evans, Athens, Alabama, paid vol 1 for D Coleman, P Barns, J W Hill, R Beaty, and T Thomas. Wm Poston, Winchester, Ky. paid for Edward Lutrell, Ben. Buckner, vol 1, and 10 dollars for T V Bush, for himself, and five subscribers, one of which is Samuel M'Murty, Cynthiana, Ky. J T Jones, Cincinnati, paid vol 1 for I Sparks and J M Cash, Mount Healthy, Hamilton county, Ohio; also, for A G Gano, I G Burnet, Esq. Mrs M Eversole, Mrs Arnetta Hotchkiss, Mrs Mary Gano, vol 1, and J Morrison, one dollar. W W Ashley, paid for vol 1 for John Mason, Thomas Haycock, Edward Baker, Thomas Parker, Archibald Henry, Jeremiah Fowler, and himself, Eastport, Maine. Moses Norvell, Nashville, Ten. paid vol 1 for W A Eichbaum, Harriet Temple, Nancy R Owen, Nancy Childress, and Wm J Turbeville. Wm Bradshaw, New Orleans, paid vol 1 to D Hughes, Adams county, Miss. Simeon Briant, Crawford county, Ohio, paid by J Briant vol 1. Daniel Conner, Morristown, Ohio, paid for vol 1.

In the receipts of last month the name of Owen Winns should have appeared instead of "J R Metcalf," Athens, Ky.

☞Receipts crowded out of this number shall appear in our next.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

{ No. 7. } BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, JULY 5, 1830. { Vol. I. }

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## Spencer Clack to the Editor of the Harbinger.

[Continued from page 267.]

BLOOMFIELD, *Ky.* May 27, 1830.

IN contending with Owen you gained a signal victory; but of what avail are victories when schism and faction, vituperation and calumny, deform Zion's lovely form? Where, now, dwells Charity, daughter of heaven, the glory and strength of the temple of God? By *this*, even by this, "*shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one for another.*" Yes, by this shall *all* men, Deists, Owenites, Infidels, all, of every class, rank, and grade in society, know that we are the disciples of Christ, if we have love one for another. Suppose you were again in debate with Owen, and he should point to the christian community, and say, "See how these christians love each other," would not your heart pain you to think how many infidels are made and confirmed by the dissentions of christians?

"But *creeds*," say you, "and the clergy, have marred the beauty of Zion; my writings, by opposing these and pleading the sufficiency of the scriptures, have excited the present commotions." Well, brother, who authorized you to say all that you have said against creeds and the clergy? Did you not call in the clergy as auxiliaries in your debate with Owen? Did you not glean from their writings more than three-fourths of your arguments in support of christianity? And did you not quote many of these same clergymen, to prove that intellect, learning, and greatness, were not the exclusive property of infidelity? And did you not quote the writings and creeds of the clergy to demonstrate the authenticity of the canonical scriptures?

Admit, however, that the clergy and the creeds have had a baneful influence over the churches—what then? Will this admission prove the creeds to be false, or the clergy to be wicked? Certainly not. The statement of the case is this: A. Campbell has published his opinions—these opinions, in many things, are in direct opposition to the creeds of the *Baptist* churches. By many Baptists they are

opposed as being pernicious in their tendency; by others *his opinions* are espoused and defended with more zeal, more untiring effort, than they ever defended their former creed. Hence divisions and schism.

I now ask you, since according to your creed, the gospel facts alone are considered the bond of union, among christians in the millennial day, why do you distract the churches by a publication of your opinions? Why wage a war against the disciples of Christ, because they reject your mere opinions, your favorite inventions, your human, unsafe, unauthorized contrivances? The churches have their creeds—you, your opinions. But say you, creeds are authoritative; my opinions are not; all men may reject my opinions, or receive them, at pleasure. Well, what then? Why not tell the brethren, in plain English, that your writings are but a human invention; the mere opinion, and nothing else, of A. Campbell; that cannot be relied on, and therefore ought not to be received? Why not tell the brethren it is foolish and wicked to forsake the book, and become the defenders of such worthless trash as human opinions; opinions, too, which create so much discord, in the TRUE church of the Redeemer?

Come, brother Campbell, let me kill Agag. You have slain the rest of the Amalekites; Agag have you spared? The creeds and opinions of all, you have endeavored to lay low; but your own opinions and inventions, which are Agag, lowing oxen and bleating sheep, you have spared! Why appoint a body guard for this *King* of the Amalekites? Is he to be spared, because he is a king? And is it necessary that the sheep and oxen of this king be brought to Gilgal for an offering to the Lord?

If the Bible is sufficient to lead us into all truth, to bring the church of God out of Babylon, to superinduce a pure speech, to restore primitive christianity, and to unite all sectaries on the one foundation, why not let it produce all these desirable things? Why pluck the laurels from the twelve Apostles of the Lamb, by attempting to effect a reformation which all the Apostles could not, and have not effected? Their writings were in the hands of every one. No one disputes their authority; by all they are beloved and esteemed; and yet it was left to the Christian Baptist, and some other kindred prints, all human inventions which cannot be relied on, to bring about "A COMPLETE RESTORATION OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF THINGS!!!" Surely this is a day of wonders, when human inventions can effect more than the Word of God itself; when things unsafe and unauthorized can land the church on a rock, both safe and authorized. Is it not marvellous that your Christian Baptist should be denominated "THE TRUTH"? George Waller and Silas M. Noel have opposed your human inventions, therefore your Millennial Harbinger says, p. 158, they are "in opposition to *the* truth." To oppose your opinions and contrivances, is to oppose the truth—fie! fie! brother Campbell, why do you talk at this rate? Come agree with us to kill Agag. We are unwilling to spare him—we think he ought not, at

boast, to reign over Israel. If you continue to praise him, and call him "THE TRUTH," in opposition, or even in connexion with him who is, indeed, *the truth*—ought we not suspect you as unfriendly to our only Master, the Lord Jesus?

The *cacoethes scribendi* (itch for writing) in the present day, has not a parallel in the annals of history. Every tyro, in biblical attainments, conceives himself profoundly qualified to instruct the saints, and to restore the ancient order of things. Indeed, were I in your place, as Editor, I should long since have been disgusted with the fulsome echo of my own opinions, furnished by the anonymous Neophytes to the sentiments of the Christian Baptist. By these writers the apostolic example is not observed. Several of the Apostles, though inspired of God, wrote nothing at all—they believed enough had been written on the ancient order, and on every other subject necessary to be known. They thought the New Testament plain enough for all; they did not add even one explanatory note, such as George Campbell's Dissertations, &c. But not so with the present age; not so with those whose avowed object is to restore the ancient order. They must make the book a little plainer; the clergy have darkened it; it must be made light *by their* writings. This is lighting a candle to teach the Sun to shine. He that follows the candle and praises it for luminous, is walking in darkness—he will be misled—he sees not the course, nor observes the full blaze of the celestial luminary.

Your Millennial Harbinger further states, that "brother Clack is, indeed, a man of some attainments, and I have regretted exceedingly to see him duped by artful and designing men, of whose character he knows nothing—to place laurels around their brows at the expense of truth and righteousness."

I must thank this brother for his sympathetic feeling for me, and must further express my regret that he labors under the very misfortune for which he pities me. Who but an artful and designing man could ever have induced him to make the statements which he has made concerning George Waller and Silas M. Noel? From what part of the canonical scriptures is he taught to publish, over an anonymous signature, these brethren as "in opposition to the truth"? What prophet or apostle ever predicted that such writings would usher in the glorious millennial reign? If this friend will but avow his name, I pledge myself to prove that he is mistaken in more particulars than one—that he has aimed a blow at a brother in the dark, contrary to the laws of Christ. In future, it is hoped, every one who feels it his duty to usher in the Millennium, by publishing the faults und failings of his brother, will affix his own proper name. In the mean time, the readers of the Harbinger are requested not to receive for gospel all that Tom, Dick, and Harry may please to write against faithful and tried ministers of the gospel.

With George Waller and Silas M. Noel I am personally acquainted, and do know that they stand high in the esteem of the Baptists generally, except those who have adopted and are now defending the

opinions and human inventions of the Christian Baptist. I say generally, making allowance for the personal enemies which every man of reputation has in his sphere of action, and which are not included in the above exception. That I have been duped by these brethren, no one believes, who is acquainted with me. My readers have learned already that such cannot be the fact.

Now, brother Campbell, I must come to a close. Excuse my desultory manner. In my next I will endeavor to be more concise. May the Lord bless you and give you grace to fulfil all his will. Do try to live in love with the brethren. When such men as Semple and Vardeman stand in direct opposition to your opinions; when they say your opinions are not the truth, but are "in opposition to the truth," ought you not to keep them (opinions) as your Universalist preacher did his universal salvation—as private property? On the whole, you and I agree pretty well as to human opinions and inventions in religion, and we should still be nigher together if you would deliver up Agag to be slain. You may rest assured that Jesus Christ does not need this Amalekite in the armies of Israel. Indeed, he ought to be considered as an enemy, because he is sowing the seeds of discord among the tribes of Israel, and raising a party, both among officers and soldiers, who seem disposed to place the crown on his head. When I hear men vehemently inveigh against the whole nation of the Amalekites, as the enemies of God and Israel—when I see them take up the sword for their total extirpation, but yet spare Agag with his sheep and oxen—I say to myself, all is not right in Denmark.

Accept assurances of my continued respect and esteem.

S. CLACK.

---

## REPLY TO BROTHER CLACK.

Brother Clack,

*Dear Sir*—YOU ask, "who athorized me to say all that I have said against creeds and the clergy?" I answer, *The New Testament.* It condemns both, and in language as strong and as forcible as I have ever used. You might as well ask me who ever authorized me to say any thing against the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition. Is it possible at this time of day, that you will defend human creeds and human clergy!

"Did I not call upon the clergy to aid me in my debate with Mr. Owen?" You might as well ask me, Did I not call upon paper-makers, printers, and book-binders, to aid me? The clergy have engrossed much of the learning of the world and all biblical learning, and to their works we are indebted for much information. This query reminds me of one often proposed with a supercilious air by the Catholics—"Protestants, why do you speak against our church of Rome and our clergy, our monks and our friars? Did you not get the scriptures and all Grecian and Roman literature through our hands? Did not our monks give you all the copies of the scriptures, and our monasteries afford you all your literature? Why then denounce them?" This is, brother Clack, your own logic; and as you would answer them, I answer you.

But let me tell you, I do not know that I was as much indebted to the clergy in my debate with Mr. Owen, as to the laity. The best works I have read on the evidences of the christian religion, are from the pens of laymen. Locke, Grotius, Verplanck, Jenyns, and R. Haldane, were laymen. And give me leave to tell you, that Jenyns on the *internal evidences*, and Haldane on the whole evidences, I think, are the two best books I have ever read on these subjects.

Your remarks upon my publishing "my opinions," were anticipated and noticed in my last. But really you labor this matter to tediousness. If I say and write that Jesus arose from the dead the third day, do you say that this is but *my opinion!* If I say that the disciples met upon the first day of the week for worship, do you tell the people that this is *my* opinion! If I exhort the churches to meet every Lord's day to worship and rejoice in the Lord; and, if to enforce it, I say or write that the apostolic churches met weekly, do you say it is only *my* opinion! If I say that christians ought to be more conformed to the spirit and behavior of the christian religion, and their practice must, if approved by the Lord, be such as the Volume requires, do you say, Why disturb the peace of the church with such an *opinion?* If I say that *immersion* and not *sprinkling* is the action which Christ enjoined, do you say that this is only *my* opinion, and that I ought not to disturb the peace of society with such an *opinion!* I fear, brother Clack, that you, in avoiding Scylla, have struck upon Charybdis.

I will join you in killing Agag or Campbellism, or whatever you please to call it, as cordially as ever did Silas M. Noel, only do not misapply these terms. Call not the weekly meeting of the disciples Campbellism; call not "immersion for the remission of sins" Campbellism; call not immersion, rather than sprinkling, Agag; call not fellowship of the saints, or weekly contributions for the poor saints, widows, and orphans, Campbellism; call not venerating the Apostles Campbellism, and keeping Agag alive. In a word, call not any institution of Jesus Christ, Campbellism. Every *Campbellism*, every *invention* of mine which you will point out to me, I will help you to burn, or drown, or exile, as the case may require. I will offer a premium to any man or woman who will produce one instance where ever I made a Campbellism, an opinion of mine, a bone of controversy, a term of communion, or shut out of a church or meeting-house any one for not honoring an opinion of mine. I challenge you and all the world to produce one such instance; and if I do not, when produced, kill that Agag, and denounce that *Campbellism*, then there is no truth in me.

But, brother Clack, your calling immersion for the remission of sins, or any other apostolic institution Campbellism, or an opinion of mine, is like telling me that the divine mission of Moses, or that the sonship of the Lord Jesus, or the resurrection of the dead, are but *opinions* of mine. Your calling upon me to kill Agag is mere religious necromancy, until you show me that witch of Endor. You

might as well exhort me to call every ill-favored old lady a witch, and command me to punish her by drowning, as to invite me to call every command and institution of the New Testament for which I plead, Campbellism. Do not call evil good, and good evil. Should you call *one* bishop and *four* churches an institution of Jesus Christ, and weekly meetings in honor of the resurrection and death of the Saviour an invention of mine, a mere Campbellism, the Lord will reprove you for calling bitter sweet, and sweet bitter.

Your three grenadier notes of admiration, to guard the capitalized sentence on page 290, may appear too formidable for nervous folks. But I am not now easily affrighted with appearances. I could have looked two phalanxes, three or six men deep, of such notes of admiration, full in the face, and with such a smile as matrons are wont to show to stripplings when they have, as they think, done something clever. "Surely this is a day of wonders." Let me tell you gravely, brother Clack, if you wish the intelligent part of the community to be convinced, you must present something more in the form of logic, than three notes of admiration. These belong to rhetoric rather than to logic.

But supposing that you think me entangled in this net, let me tell you that not the obscurity of the scriptures, nor their inadequacy to guard the church or save the world, is the cause of my having written the Christian Baptist, or my writing the present work. And, as proof of it, I will tell you, let the Bible be given without note or comment, or any writing on the subject of religion, to the people—let all the publications on the subject of religion be stopped—let all religious writings but *the oracles*, and such literature as is necessary to translate them correctly, be congregated into one great pile, and I will make a torch of the Christian Baptist and the Harbinger to set them all on fire. Or let all the papers destined to sustain the clergy and their enterprize be stopped, and I will not write another essay. We only wish to place the Apostles before the people, where the Lord placed them, upon thrones to give laws to his people. We labor to get the people to read the scriptures: and a thousand times I have been pleased to learn, that a more general reading and searching of the scriptures have been the accompaniments of my labors. I can appeal to the North and to the South, to the East and to the West of this Union, whether in every neighborhood where these works have been circulated, there have not been more reading, searching, and examination of the scriptures, than were ever known before. This is the direct tendency of all my labors, *viva voce*, and with the pen.

If there is, then, here a contradiction between my principles and my practice, keener eyes than mine must detect and show it to me. If, in travelling through the country, I visited a family who had a Bible, but neglected to read it, and read every thing else they had leisure for; if I should persuade them to read that Book, and actually succeed in displacing others, and in giving the chief place to the Apostles' testimony—what would you think of that person's intellect who would report that "Campbell's *invention*" in that family had done

more than the twelve Apostles? Answer this at your leisure, and make such application of it as you think reason will approve.

In the next paragraph, tired of three notes of admiration, you give me two *fies*—"*fie, fie, brother Campbell.*" You ought to have added *fee, fum.* Is this the style of one christian to his equal, or to his inferior! And after all, there is no such thing said by brother Campbell in page 158. "Brother Campbell" does not occupy a line in page 158. It is "Querens;" and he does not use the words "*the truth*" in your acceptation of them—please read page 158 again.

I will go hand in hand with you, brother Clack, in denouncing the tyro's "*cacoethes scribendi*" (itch for writing.) But there are so many tyros on the side of Babylon, we may be permitted to have a few on the side of Jerusalem. *Young* tyros are sufferable, but the *old* tyros, old in years and young in mind, like onions with white heads, and green minds in the knowledge of christianity, are much more irksome to my old man than these young tyros. Some of the double D's are the greatest tyros I know; and some of the tyros of the present day are equal to the Rabbis of former times. Indeed, I would not be surprised if some one of them should say, "Well, brother Clack, I wish you had thought a little sooner upon this tyro—itch for scribbling—before you began the Baptist Recorder." I have seen some of them who would even dare to do this.

That christian charity of which you suppose the Christian Baptist so deficient, could, I think, have been better exhibited in your remarks upon a quotation from "Querens," p. 158, than it seems to be. You have ascribed to him that of which I cannot see him guilty; and had you thought proper to reply to his sympathies for you, I cannot see why you should have selected two words from the 158th page not pertaining to you, and given to them a construction very forced, at least. This much in passing. If Dr. Noel has any explanation to make for himself in reference to the matters concerning which Querens inquires, I will, with pleasure, allow him page for page with Querens. But mere personal altercations I have neither room nor taste for. Whatever can elicit inquiry and promote the examination of the scriptures, is quite *a-propos.*

In your next you promise to be more concise and connect. To this I have no objection. But, my brother Clack, I wish you to do more than to be concise and connect—take up and discuss some one point at a time. Take up some of those things you call *Campbellisms*, or some of those matters you call my *peculiarities*, and leave off all personal allusions. Tell me not of such men "as Semple and Vardeman as being in direct opposition to my opinions." I do not know that this is the fact. In ninety *opinions* in every hundred, it is probable we exactly agree; and if in ten per cent. of our *opinions* we differ, can we not forbear one another in love? If we agree in *faith*, what if we differ in *opinions?* I wish you would define what you mean by *opinion.* I have defined myself. But what do you mean by naming *Semple and Vardeman!* Do you make *Popes* of them!

Will it not hurt their feelings to see their names so used? Would either of these gentlemen set up his *name* against reason or argument? Would either of them decide a question by the weight of his name! If they would not, why should you attempt to hush inquiry by arraying them before me? Or was it, *ad captandum vulgus*, to inveigle those who wish others to think for them, and who have not time to think for themselves? You know me, I hope, too well to think to awe me by great names. Besides, these brethren, great as they may be, (and it is better to be *good* than great,) are great men of a certain cast. We have great soldiers, great mechanics, great merchants, great mathematicians, great politicians, great linguists, great logicians, great orators, great reasoners, great declaimers, great scripturеans, great speculators, and great christians. A great mathematician may be a little christian, and a great christian may be a little mathematician. A great scripturean may be a little declaimer, and a great declaimer may be a little scripturean.

I respect these brethren as much as you do, but I am not governed in my inquiries by their veto. And I am much deceived in them, if they wish other christians to be governed by their decisions. I do not flatter them. I have no kingdom to hold or gain by flatteries. But I have been ashamed of some who have burned censers full of incense to these brethren to secure them to their side of the question. I have had none to offer. And I know these brethren so well, as to be assured that their consciences approve my course towards them personally, more than they do those who have sacrificed to them. I know they are both eminent men of a certain school, and of a certain age; but in other respects they are common men. Their education and habits were not such as to make them great men in any department other than that in which they have labored so long. I venerate them as highly —nay, I doubt not, more highly, than some of their sycophantic admirers. But I esteem their goodness more than their greatness. Their opposition to some of my writings neither proves them true nor false. And as neither of them will be judged for me in the day of judgment, I will not allow them now to judge for me. But I have so much confidence in them as to think that they claim no such right; and I am of opinion that they have so much good sense as to allow that, even in the points in which we differ, I have as good a chance to judge correctly as they have. I know a hundred men who have never been in a pulpit, whose judgment with me goes as far as any hundred men who have grown grey in the "sacred desk;" nay, farther, in any question about "*What say the scriptures?*" And this is the question which most of all concerns you and me; not *Have any of the rulers believed it?* but *What say the scriptures?* In asking and answering this question I will go with you, and will always bow unreservedly to their authority; but to none else. May this be your determination and your practice! is the prayer of one who will not flatter the great, nor disdain the humble; but who loves and honors all who love and honor the Prince of Peace.

EDITOR.

P. S.—To many of your epithets you will see I have paid no attention—such as "the *baneful* influence of my writings;" "*wicked* clergy;" "*true* church;" "the *mere* opinion of A. Campbell," "you call the Christian Baptist *the truth*," &c. &c. These I leave with your "Tom, Dick, and Harry," for those who have a taste for such morsels. If I have published the fulsome panegyrics of friends, I have not failed to season them with plenty of such splenetic detractions as some would be apt to call many of your boldest and finest tropes. The sweets of adulation, as some think them, have been neutralized by the bitterness of condemnation; so that the composition is not too strong for even a squeamish stomach. EDITOR.

## PHILALETHES ON THE SCRIPTURES.

[*Continued from page* 279.]

7. GOD'S instrument of instruction secures to each of the saints, faithful men, or believers in Christ, (for these terms denote precisely the same persons,) the noble privilege and high honor of being entrusted with a just share of Christ's work on earth. Christ has not distributed his work unfairly among his servants, nor his honors unjustly among his followers. He has not assigned one sort of labor to one servant, and another to another. On the contrary, he has not only permitted, but encouraged and commanded each to do all he can, of any thing, and every thing, which can further his Master's service, in secret, in private, and in public. Ability, opportunity, and disposition for which, and not Christ's partiality or arbitrary appointment, determine both the kind and the quantity of labor which each of his friends may perform; every part of his service being open alike to every laborer, with a very few designated exceptions.

8. God's instrument of instruction subverts at once all the arrogant and exclusive pretensions of the self-created order of men called *the Clergy*. Qualifying and empowering every saint, faithful man or believer, to do every act of which Christ's work consists, it leaves no peculiar, no exclusive labor for the men to perform, who have for many ages arrogated to themselves the designation of *God's lot*, and the exclusive performance of all the most lucrative, dignified and important functions of Christ's kingdom. It reduces every member of Christ's family to his proper place; that is, to the place to which his knowledge, faith, love, obedience, and service assign him. It entrusts no part of Christ's work to incapable, unfaithful, or treacherous men. It puts confidence in none but saints. They alone are authorized to intermeddle with their Maker's work, and no part of it is denied to any of them, with the few exceptions already alluded to.

9. God's instrument of instruction *alone* possesses a harmonizing, assimilating tendency. It is pre-eminently—nay, exclusively qualified to bring all who consult and obey it, to the same belief, to the same rational and ardent devotion, mutual love, and christian practice. Presenting to every reader and to every hearer the same plain information, it can scarcely fail to produce among intelligent and reverential inquirers unanimous opinion. Exhibiting to all the same glorious object of adoration and worship, it must excite in all the same veneration, love, and obedience. Proposing to all the same interesting and powerful motives, it cannot but awaken in all the same ardent pursuit—and setting before the minds of all its votaries, their fellow-creatures, as bound together by the most endearing relations, as children of the same family, as participants of the same hopes, fears, and interests, how can it fail to beget kind feelings, mutual good will, complacency, and delight? Nor is this a picture drawn by a feverish imagination. These happy effects were actually produced among christians as long as they continued to use no other instrument of instruction than that with which God had himself provided them. When

*alone* employed, it answered its purpose fully. It brought glory to God, salvation, harmony, good will, and peace to men.

10. It saves time. Small is the portion of time and labor that any person who seeks religious information by consulting his Bible directly will be compelled to expend in order to acquire a sufficient quantity of it, in comparison of the time and labor which he must waste who seeks his religious instruction from creeds, confessions, catechisms, tracts, pamphlets, lectures, orations, speeches, discourses, arguments, sermons, commentaries, paraphrases, expositions, economies, or corpulent bodies of divinity. The former will acquire more religious knowledge in *one hour* than the latter will grabble out of his human repositories *in months*. Indeed, to attempt to collect religious information from such means, is to murder time.

11. God's instrument of instruction is the only convenient one. It is, or may be, ready at all times. By day and by night, whether sick or well, in ease or in pain, in sorrow or in joy, in trouble or in peace, the blessed volume is at hand, and ready to impart whatever is necessary to the consolation and improvement of our souls. To obtain its precious benefits we have not to travel over hill and dale, scale mountains, and stem torrents, scorch with heat, or freeze with cold; nor have we to flatter, coax, follow, and pay a fellow-man, or incur vast expense of any kind to procure it.

12. It is unexpensive. It yields a free repast. Here wine and milk, the most pleasing, interesting, and improving information, are presented without money and without price. To its salubrious streams, to its health-restoring waters, whoever is athirst may repair and drink freely. A copy of a Bible costs but little.

13. It puts it in our power to pursue the only natural, rational, sure, and, indeed, usual method of acquiring information. What is that method? Certainly when we have an original communication to consult *it*, and not what men may say about it. Undoubtedly this is the course recommended by common sense, and pursued on every similar occasion. Christians are the only persons who commit the absurdity of preferring the conjectures, opinions, notions, reveries, and dreams of other men about an original communication, to seeing with their own eyes, and hearing with their own ears, the uncorrupted original itself. This is no doubt strange, but it is nevertheless true; for christians do actually prefer to the pure, unmixed, unadulterated milk of God's word, human transformations of it into catechisms, creeds, confessions, tracts, sermons, lectures, commentaries, expositions, economies, paraphrases, orations, arguments, discourses, and ponderous bodies of divinity.

14. God's instrument of religious instruction brings heaven down to earth. It brings into our ignorant, wicked, and miserable world that knowledge which makes heaven *heaven;* that knowledge of God and divine things which is destined to delight—nay, to enrapture the pure spirits of the blessed through endless duration.

15 God's instrument of instruction is alone qualified to make those who are ignorant of the contents of sacred writ, acquainted with it, no matter whether they can or cannot read it themselves. For unless the very words of God's message be either read to them, or read by them, it is utterly impossible that, by any other means, they can, *with certainty,* acquire the knowledge of it. When what is, in modern phrase, called a preacher, or writer, tells, or rather pretends to tell the ignorant what the Bible, according to his notion of its meaning, contains, how is it possible that they who know nothing of its meaning themselves can know whether his account of its meaning be correct or not? It is utterly impossible. If, then, the ignorant receive their preacher's or commentator's meaning of sacred writ, as correct, without some surer ground for their belief than his notion of it, it is manifest that their belief must rest entirely on human authority—that is, that they receive as divine information what their preacher tells them is divine information, merely because he says so; for it is plain that they have nothing but his assertion to satisfy them that there is a particle of divinity in his representation of it. Forever, therefore, until they either read the scriptures themselves or hear them read, just as the Spirit

has himself worded them, must those who are ignorant of them remain in doubt whether what their teachers communicate to them as God's word be in reality God's word or a human misrepresentation of it; for they have no means except a direct appeal to the words of sacred writ itself, by which they can possibly detect misrepresentation if it has occurred in their preacher's exhibition of its meaning. No wonder, then, that Paul commanded his letters to be *read* in the christian societies to whom they were sent, and not to be employed as *texts for sermons*, or materials for lectures, commentaries, paraphrases, &c. And moreover, these plain facts show us the deplorable condition of those deluded creatures among whom christianity has been introduced, if when so introduced it can be called christianity, not by publishing God's word to them just as it stands in the sacred records, but as mangled, modified, and misrepresented by what is styled "preaching" in modern phraseology, for in scripture nothing is called *preaching* but the publication of God's inspired message in his own inspired words.

16. Our all-wise and most attentive sovereign, like every judicious commander, has furnished every soldier in his army with a complete suit of spiritual arms, made at his own expense, according to his own direction, out of materials wholly divine, and of the most exact similarity. Christ's army militant, as well as triumphant, appears in the most perfect uniform. He knows too well the necessity and advantage of such similar and heavenly made armor, to leave its selection and fabrication to the ignorance and incapacity of his imperfect soldiers. He therefore devised, prepared, and put into the hands of each of his militant friends, such weapons as he judged to be best adapted to the furtherance of his service, especially the spiritual sword, that highly tempered and hourly needed instrument of both defence and attack. But notwithstanding all the great wisdom, care, and caution manifested in this matter by the illustrious Leader of the Saints, the clergy, who pretend to high rank in his army, have treated his wisdom, care, and caution with contempt, and have preferred weapons devised and fabricated by themselves, out of materials almost entirety human, to his divine provision. To fight the battles of the Lord and destroy the power of the grand adversary, (not by celestial weapons, but by their own,) here one comes forth, vaporing and blustering, with a sermon, perhaps spun like a cobweb out of his own brain, or perhaps stolen from a brother warrior. There another exhibits, strutting with his mighty tool, a lecture, paraphrase, commentary, or perhaps a fabulous tract, or it may be a huge body of divinity, of which it is likely not one thought out of a thousand can be found which originated with its ostensible author; but let the thoughts which they contain originate with whomsoever they may, one character is common to all of them—they are all the notions, opinions, conjectures, or reveries of uninspired fallible men, and of course unfit to constitute a foundation for that faith which rests on nothing inferior to the explicit declarations of that God who can neither lie nor be deceived in any of his communications.

PHILALETHES.

## THE FOURTH OF JULY.

A NUMBER of disciples, principally members of the Church of Christ in Pittsburg, agreed to have a *love feast* on Monday, the 5th of July, instant. They chose that day in *honor of the fourth of July*, 1776. Grateful to Heaven for the blessings which that day vouchsafed the citizens of this country, they thought that christians participating in them ought *religiously* to call to mind the goodness of God in granting that deliverance. While the children of *this* world, with voluptuous joys and noisy mirth, are regarding the day because of the *political* privileges which they inherit, we know of no good reason why christians may not, if they please, consecrate the day to

the Lord as a *free-will offering*, and convert the occasion into one of joy and rejoicing in the Rock of their Salvation, giving glory to the Governor of the Nations of the Earth, that they are made *free* citizens, not only of a free government on *earth*, but of the kingdom of *heaven*.

More than a hundred and twenty disciples, with sundry visitants and many children, dined together in an arbor about two miles from the city. The day was spent in joy and gladness of heart, singing the praises of the Lord, and in conversing about the good things of the heavenly country. I had the pleasure of pronouncing the following Oration immediately before dinner. After the Oration the following song was sung:—

Behold! the mountain of the Lord
In latter days shall rise,
On mountain tops, above the hills,
And draw the wond'ring eyes!

To this the joyful nations round,
All tribes and tongues shall flow;
"Up to the hill of God," they'll say,
"And to his house we'll go."

The beam that shines from Zion hill
Shall 'lighten ev'ry land;
The King who reigns in Salem's towers
Shall all the world command!

Among the nations he shall judge;
His judgments truth shall guide;
His sceptre shall protect the just,
And quell the sinner's pride!

No strife shall rage, nor hostile feuds
Disturb those peaceful years!
To ploughshares men shall beat their swords
To pruning hooks their spears!

No longer host encount'ring host,
Shall crowds of slain deplore?
They'll hang the trumpet in the hall,
And study war no more!

Come, then, O house of Jacob! come
To worship at his shrine!
And, walking in the light of God,
With holy beauties shine!

After dinner brother *Walter Scott* delivered a very interesting discourse on *the great and notable day of the Lord*, which is to introduce the Millennium. Many citizens assembled to hear the discourse. After which we proceeded to the river, where five persons were immersed into the ancient faith. Thus closed one of the most joyful anniversaries of our national independence which we ever witnessed. Every incident of the day was pleasing and agreeable, and the whole celebration was well adapted to promote the edification and comfort of every disciple of the Prince of Peace. All was conducted in the simplicity, decency, and good order which become the christian profession.

EDITOR.

# AN ORATION

*IN HONOR OF THE FOURTH OF JULY.*

CHRISTIAN CITIZENS,

OMNIPOTENT is the word of God! He spake, and a world was made! *Let there be light*, he said, *and light there was!* He uttered his voice, and from darkness light was born! from chaos order sprang, and from an inert mass of lifeless matter animated beings of ten thousand ranks and orders stand forth in life triumphant!

Thus came the Universe from the command of God. But how gradual and progressive was the developement of the wisdom, power, and goodness of the Almighty Maker! Light was the first born; next, the aerial expanse, called heaven; then the water heard his voice, and of the terraqueous globe this element first felt the impulse of the all-creating energy. It was congregated into its aerial and terrestrial chambers. Naked from the womb of waters the earth appeared. The new-born earth God clothed with verdure—with all the charms of vegetable beauty—and gave to its apparel a conservative principle, a reproducing power.

Light was itself chaotic until the fourth day. No luminaries garnished the firmament until the week of Creation was more than half expired. It was then the Sun, Moon, and Stars were lighted up by the great Father of Lights. Until the earth was born of water, no Sun beamed in heaven—no ray of celestial light shone upon its face. No life was in the Earth until the Sun beamed upon it. Then were the waters peopled, and from them came forth the inhabitants of the air. In the domain of this wonderful element life was first conceived and exhibited.

The race of earthborns, creatures of a grosser habit, did not hear the voice of God until the sixth day. On that day they obeyed the command of God, and stepped forth into life. Then the Almighty changed his style. Till then his commands were all addressed in the third person. "*Let there be*" was the preamble, "*and there was*" was the conclusion. But now, *Let us make man*, and let us make him after another model. The only being made after a model was man. All other creatures were originals. Towards him if any creature approached in any one similitude, it was in anticipation. Man steps forth into life in the image of his Maker, and found himself the youngest child of the universe, but the darling of his Father and his God. Here the chapter of Creation closes, and man has the last period.

Such was the value stamped on man by his Creator. A world is made and peopled for him; a palace reared, and furnished, and decorated for his abode; the great Architect plans and executes the edifice, and then introduces to its richest apartment the favorite of the universe. 'Tis here we are taught the science—'tis here we learn the numbers which, when combined with wisdom, tell of how much account we are.

On man thus valued, dignified, and honored by his Maker, a lord-

ship is conferred. Over all that swims, that flies, or that walks upon the earth, his dominion extends. The crown placed upon his head had attractions which angels saw, and charms which angels felt. Man thus placed in Eden, with his Eve *from* and *by* his side; having all its fruits, and flowers, and sweets, and charms under his control, with the smallest reservation in favor of the Absolute Sovereign of the Universe; having, too, the whole earth, from Eden's flowery banks to both the poles, subject to his will—becomes the most enviable object in all the great empire of the universe. His fortune was not to *make*—'twas only to *keep*. But, Alas! to one destitute of experience, however exalted, how hard to guard, how difficult to retain possessions gratuitously acquired!

Man, the last best work of God, environed with the riches and glory of a world, built, and furnished, and smiling for him, is envied, and his ruin meditated by the Prince of Apostates. He falls through his machinations. From God and Eden he falls at once, and involves with him the fortunes of a world!

For his recovery a remedial system is set on foot by his Creator. And such a system it is, as was worthy of its Author and of the admiration of an intelligent universe. To turn from the catastrophe of man to this recuperative system, is, of all transitions, the most grateful to the human mind. This is "*a theme which never, never old shall grow.*" Eternity itself, vast and unbounded as it is, can never do more than develope it. Time furnishes but the scaffolding for rearing this temple of science. 'Tis in a temple yet to be built this science is to be perfected, to be taught, and to be learned.

The knowledge of God is all the bliss which rational beings can propose to themselves. This knowledge, indeed, requires an acquaintance with all his works. For as we learn men only by their works, we learn our Creator only by his works. But *here* we are only in the alphabet, and *here* we never can rise above it: and few, indeed, in this life acquire an accurate knowledge of the art of reading God. The *primer* which God has put into the hands of man in this primary school is divided into three chapters. The heads of these are *Creation*, *Providence*, and *Redemption*. 'Tis God alone which, to the initiated, is seen in every character, word, and sentence, in this elementary volume. And he that sees not God in every sentence of this *primer*, knows neither himself nor any thing in the universe.

This memorable occasion, fellow-citizens of she kingdom of God, calls for a few remarks on the past, the present, and the future providence of God. Aided by the lights of the living oracles, we can look back to the birth of Time, and forward to the funeral of Nature, Time, and Death. Looking back through the long vista of past ages, beyond the birth of the empires of antiquity, beyond the birth of kings, and emperors, and governments, we find a world without *civil* government. This is farther back than human records and chonology extend; but not farther than the records and chronology, which God has vouchsafed us, reach. In a world without civil government, the earth was filled with violence, and crime multiplied until in the judgment

of God the dstruction of the whole race, with a single exception, became indispensable. As water first felt the creative energy of God, by it the first general judgment was inflicted. The anarchists were drowned; and in their death and burial the earth was washed from the pollutions of one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years.

In the New World an avenger of crime, and especially of blood, is the first institution. The second chapter of the history of the divine government over men, begins with the establishment of civil government. The inhabitants of the New World were filed off into small groups, called *tribes*, and the first effort to resist this arrangement was avenged with the confusion of human speech, which made a dispersion unavoidable. Patriarchs and princes over these small detachments of human beings, called *nations*, wielded the sceptre for nearly a thousand years without any remarkable incident. Cities, and towns, and palaces were reared and ruined during the interval from the Deluge till the erection of a religious nation. At that time tribes had grown up into nations, and nations began to form alliances, and thus empires began to be. As these increased idolatry began to increase. The larger the groups of human beings, either in cities or empires, the more idolatrous they became. They refined in crime until idolatry became the desolating sin of the second world, as violence was the damning sin of the antediluvian world.

To save the second world from one general ruin, a religious nation was erected, upon all the institutions of which, the Divinity was inscribed, and in such a way that nothing but the annihilation of that nation could annihilate the knowledge of the one only living and true God. This nation began in miracle, progressed in miracle, was governed specially, or by miracle, and though exiled from its possessions because of its crimes, miraculously exists still a monument of the jealousy of God, and carrying with it every where a proof of the Divinity which no ingenuity, however perverse, can obliterate or deface. It held its possessions in the land allotted to it for nearly one thousand five hundred years.

Then opens a new era. A Celestial King is born, and born to reign over the human race forever. The principles of his government, in their grand essentials, are new principles. This new institution, new once, and still new in contrast with the past and with the reigning earthly systems, is called significantly, *the Reign of Heaven*. The King is heaven-born and divine. Heavenly and divine are the principles of his government; and though his subjects live a while on earth, his government is designed to give them a taste of, and a taste for, heavenly things.

His government began in conquest, by conquest still increases, and will by increasing conquests ultimately subdue all things to himself. On a white horse, with a single crown upon his head, with a bow, and quiver, full of arrows, in the book of symbols, he appears going forth to war. But at the end of the long campaign he appears again with many crowns upon his head, with all the kingdoms of the

world in his train, and with the trophies of many battles, worshipped as the King of kings and the Lord of lords.

The cardinal principle in his government is love. He subdues not by any other sword than that of the Spirit. Other kings subdue men's persons, and hold a sovereignty over their estates; but he seizes the hearts of men. To conquer enemies is his grand enterprize.—Philosophy as well as religion teaches us that to conquer enemies is not the work of swords, nor lances, nor bows of steel. It is not to bind men's persons to a triumphal car, to incarcerate them in strong holds, or to make them surrender to superior bravery, prowess, and strength. *To conquer an enemy is to convert him into a friend.* This is the noble, benevolent, and heaven-conceived enterprize of God's only begotten Son. To do this all arms and modes of warfare are impotent, save the arms and munitions of everlasting love. By vivid displays of God's philanthropy, he approaches his enemies, and by the arguments with which this eloquence is fraught, he addresses a rebel world. Such is his mode of warfare; a system devised in heaven, and, like all God's means, perfectly adapted to the high ends proposed.

But not to lose sight of the great outline of things begun, let us pause and survey the chapters which we have scanned. In the first we saw society without civil government; in the second, society with civil government without religious associations; in the third, society under a politico-religious government; and in the fourth chapter, a scheme begun which contemplates the government of men by religion without politics, by the efficacy of one principle alone. This is the chapter of chapters now in progress, and full of the greatest and most astonishing incidents. We saw the rise, progress, and issue of three states of society; but as yet we cannot distinctly see the issue of the present. Its progress we may survey, and its tendency we may appreciate; but its full developement and glorious issue are, perhaps, too far removed from our optics and from our experience clearly and distinctly to apprehend.

But to aid us in looking *forward*, let us again look *back*. Christianity, or the New Institution, was set up under a Jewish government. Under that government it existed for a time; thence it passed under a Pagan government; next under a Papal government; and now, in this portion of the earth, it has come under a *political* government.

Under a circumscribed Jewish government it began. With this it did not, it could not coalesce. Over that government it ultimately triumphed. The principles of that government and of the government of Jesus Christ were at variance, and therefore one or the other must be destroyed. That government fell, and fell chiefly through its opposition to christianity.

It next passed under a Pagan government. The conflict soon began, and the Pagan government fell. Christianity triumphed. But let it be distinctly marked that Christianity set itself in no other way against either the Jewish or Pagan government, than as its principles tended to bestow upon mankind a happiness from which that govern-

ment debarred them; and therefore the religion of Jesus—though passive in that conflict, and imperial Rome armed with all political power, and allied by all the superstitions of past ages, active in opposing it—prevailed and broke to pieces the Pagan power which resisted it.

Papal Rome rises out of the ruins of Pagan Rome. Christianity is then subjected to a more insidious and a more unconquerable government. This government, by its largesses to christianity, and by its paganized christian institutes, held its dominion longer over the institution of Jesus than ever did, or than ever can, any government ostensibly opposed to its principles. But yet over this christianity is triumphing, and so far has triumphed that the New World has set up twenty-four governments, and is setting up others, upon principles at variance with all the papal and pagan governments of the Old World. So far, then, Christianity has triumphed and is triumphing over Papal Rome.

Citizens of the Reign of Heaven, let us for a moment turn our eyes to that government under which christianity exists in this most favored of all lands, in this wide and capacious and still extending empire. Tired and jaded with the conflicts of Papal Rome, grieved and incensed at the infractions of the rights of conscience and the rights of men, with all the tyrannies of conflicting sectarian institutions, our ancestors sought a city of refuge, a hiding place from the storm, in this newly discovered section of the patrimony of Japheth. God, more than four thousand years ago, promised to Japheth an enlargement of his territory, when he gave him the broken and indented patrimony of Europe. Here he found it; and our fathers, taught in the schools of papal and sectarian proscription, imagined that a government without any religion, a government purely deistical, sceptical, or political, was the *summum bonum*—the very maximum of social bliss. They went as far as mortals, stung with the fiery dragon, could go, to devise a government without a single religious institution. They succeeded not only in *declaring*, but in *sustaining* their independence of all the sons of pride; and in building for themselves and their children political institutions, which have hitherto secured, and will continue, we hope, to secure, till christianity conquers the world, the greatest portion of political and temporal happiness hitherto enjoyed by any people. This government proposes only to guard the temporal and worldly rights of men. It regards this world only as the appropriate object of its supervision and protection. It permits every man to be of no religion, or of any religion he pleases It has no partialities for the Jew, the Christian, the Turk, or the Indian. Such is its creed. Here the affairs of another world are left to themselves. The government says to all the rival sectarian interests, "FAIR PLAY, AND THE RIGHTS OF MEN!" It will not help by its statutes, nor retard by its proscriptions, any religion, nor sect of religionists, now on the theatre. This is all that christianity asks, or can ask, until she conquers the world. Whenever a sect calls for the governmental arm to help her—to hold her up—she proclaims herself overmatched by her com-

petitors, and declares her consciousness that on the ground of *reason* and *evidence* she is unable to stand.

The present government aims at being *purely political*, and therefore can secure only man's political rights and promote his political happiness. This is all that worldly men wish; and it is all that a sectarian profession of religion can reasonably or justly require. He is a tyrant in principle, and would be one in practice, who asks for *exclusive privileges*. None but tyrants and knaves have ever sought pre-eminence by law or by force!

But still we are far from considering that a political government can ever fill up the measure of human, of social, of rational enjoyment. And all confess that were men truly religious political government would be unnecessary. So far this is a concession in favor of our grand position, *that Jesus Christ will yet govern the world by religion only, and that by the operation of one single principle.* Then shall they literally "beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and learn war no more." Christianity rightly understood, cordially embraced, and fully carried out in practice, will as certainly subvert all political government, the very best as well as the very worst, as did the Jewish institution and people subvert and supplant the seven nations which once occupied the land of Canaan.

The admirers of American liberty and American institutions have no cause to regret such an event, nor cause to fear it. It will be but the removing of a tent to build a temple—the falling of a cottage after the family are removed into a castle. Not by might, nor by sword, but by the Spirit of the Lord will the political institutions of our government be laid aside. The Sun itself and the systems of worlds which revolve round it we can well dispense with when we arrive in the Palace of the Universe, where GOD is the Sun, the Light, and the Glory. So our best political institutions we can part with without a tear or a sigh, when Jesus reigns on earth, and has placed a throne in every heart and built a temple in every family.

The *fourth of July*, 1776, was a memorable day, a day to be remembered as was the Jewish Passover—a day to be regarded with grateful acknowledgments by every American citizen, by every philanthropist in all the nations of the world. The light which shines from our political institutions will penetrate even the dungeons of European despots, *for the genius of our government is the genius of universal emancipation!* Nothing can resist the political influence of a great nation, enjoying great political advantages, if she walk worthy of them. The example which our government gives is necessarily terrible to the crowned heads of Europe, and exhilarating to all who look for the redemption of man from political degradation.

But there is the superlative as well as the comparative degree. A more illustrious day is yet in prospect—a day when it shall be said, "Rejoice over her, you holy Apostles and Prophets, for God has avenged you on her!"—a day on which an angel shall proclaim, "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord!"—a

day on which it shall be sung, "The kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven is given to the people of the Most High, and all people shall serve and obey him!" This will be a day of gladness only to be surpassed by the joys of the resurrection.

The American Revolution is but the precursor of a revolution of infinitely more importance to mankind. It was a great, a happy, and a triumphant revolution. But time and space limit and circumscribe all its blessings to mankind. It will long, perhaps always, be accounted an illustrious and a happy era in the history of man. Many thanksgivings and praises have reached unto heaven because of this great deliverance. The incense of gratitude, perfumed with the praises of saints, has long risen from myriads of hearts, and will continue to rise until the cloud shall cover the whole earth, and the glory of the Lord be reflected upon all the nations of the earth

The praises of a Washington, a Franklin, and a Jefferson, will long resound through the hills and vallies of this spacious country, and will, in proportion as men are prepared to taste the blessings to result from the next revolution, continually increase. Posterity will only mingle their regrets, that, like Moses, all their political leaders died short of the promised land—that while they guided the tribes almost to Canaan, they fell in the wilderness without tasting the sweets of the good inheritance.

A more glorious work is reserved for this generation—a work of as much greater moment, compared with the Revolution of '76, as immortality is to the present span of human life—the emancipation of the human mind from the shackles of superstition, and the introduction of human beings into the full fruition of the Reign of Heaven. To liberate the minds of men from sectarian tyrannies—to deliver them from the melancholy thraldom of relentless systems, is a work fraught with greater blessings, and a work of a nobler daring and loftier enterprize than the substitution of a representative democracy for an absolute or limited monarchy. This revolution, taken in all its influences, will make men free indeed. A political revolution can only make men politically free to task themselves, and to exact from themselves a service which few of the despots of more barbarous climes inflict upon their veriest slaves.

Talk not of liberty which only makes men greater slaves. Under the monarchies of the Old World men are more free from themselves than under the free government of these United States. The reason is, under this free government the citizens have the opportunity and the liberty of improving and bettering their circumstances to such an extent as to engross all their energies, to call forth all their powers: hence, upon themselves they impose such tasks and inflict such toils and privations as few of the monarchs of the East would be so cruel as to impose upon their subjects. Here in this land of liberty, we see all men in one incessant stretch. The accomplishment of one or more projects does not diminish their labors nor their enterprize. Quite the reverse—the more successful the more eager to commence

again. And how often, how very often, do we see men dying under the whip of their own cupidity, in full harness pulling up the hill of their own ambition, when death kindly interposes, takes the burthen off their galled shoulders, and strips them for the shroud! Yet they boast of being free! Free to make slaves of themselves!! If the Son of God has made them free, they would not thus toil till the last pulsation of their hearts.

Men love independence, and of this we boast. Yet there is not a perfect consistency in our assumptions upon this subject. We have heard men boast of their independence, when the tailor, the cord-wainer, the merchant, and the physician were continually called upon for their services. We have heard our citizens boast of their national independence when almost every article of their apparel, even to the buttons on their wrists, were of foreign growth and manufacture. And what is still more inconsistent, we have heard our fellow-citizens boasting of political independence, and content to import their creed from Scotland, to yield to a system manufactured in Geneva, and at the same time slavishly serving divers lusts and passions, and living under the dominion of the fiercest passions and most grovelling propensities of human nature. And yet they boast of being independent!

Conscience makes slaves as well as cowards of multitudes who boast of being free. No person under the fear of death ever can be free. They who are afraid of the consequences of death are all their lifetime in bondage. To escape from this vassalage is worthy of the greatest struggle which man could make. This, however, is the first boon which christianity tenders to all who put themselves under its influence. It proclaims a jubilee to the soul—it opens the prison doors, and sets the captives free. The King of Saints holds not one of his voluntary subjects under a vassalage so cruel. The corruptions of antichristian systems are admirably adapted to increase and cherish this fear, which tends to bondage; but to those who embrace and bow to the real gospel, there is bestowed a full deliverance, and a gracious exemption from this most grievous bondage of the soul.

But when I name the true gospel, the proclamation of God's philanthropy, the Declaration of the Independence of the Kingdom of Jesus; I am constrained to remind you, my fellow-citizens of the christian kingdom, that this is the mighty instrument by which this world is to be revolutionized—this is the sword of the Eternal Spirit—this is that weapon which is mighty, through God, to the demolition of all the strong holds of the man of sin, as well as of that strong one that rules and reigns in the hearts of the children of disobedience. By it alone, proclaimed, and proved, and sustained in the lives of its advocates, were the Jewish and Pagan institutions of former ages substituted by the Christian, and that great change in society effected which is still blessing the earth with the influences of peace and good will. By its influences the leopard and the kid, the lion and the lamb have in innumerable instances been made the most friendly associates

and companions. It imparts courage to the timid, strength to the infirm, hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb. It gives peace to the conscience, rest to the soul, ardor to the affections, and animation to the hopes of men. It is God's wisdom and his power, because it is his philanthropy drawn to the life, and exhibited by the strongest argument in the universe—the death of his only Son.

To introduce the last and most beneficial change in society, it is only necessary to let the gospel, in its own plainness, simplicity, and force, speak to men. Divest it of all the appendages of human philosophy, falsely so called, and of all the traditions and dogmas of men; and in its power it will pass from heart to heart, from house to house, from city to city, until it bless the whole earth. See how contagious it is. Since it began to be proclaimed, and sustained by the ancient order of things, see what changes it has made, and what effects it has produced, and with what rapidity it has spread over the country! More new churches have been formed within twelve months, where the primitive gospel has been proclaimed with clearness and power, than the twelve preceding years can count under the humanized gospel of the sects.

While the mere politicians of the land and the children of the flesh are rejoicing together around their festive boards, and in toasts and songs boasting of their heroes and themselves, we ought to glory in the Lord, rejoice in the God of our salvation, and sing a loftier song of purer joy than they. And while with them we remember with gratitude the achievements of the patriots of the land, we ought to rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory in recollecting the Christian Chief and his holy Apostles, who has made us free indeed, and given us the rank and dignity, not of citizens of earthly states, but of heaven. Yes, he is worthy of all gratitude, and of all adoration too, who has made all the citizens of his kingdom not citizens only, but citizen kings and priests to God.

While they extol the bloody battles of the warrior, as "every battle of the warrior is with confused noise and garments rolled in blood," let us not forget the victories of him who did not lift up his voice in the streets—who did not use so much as a broken reed, nor consume a single torch until he made his laws victorious. In that spirit of mildness, meekness, and unostentatious heroism, let us fight the good fight of faith, and as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, let us all be found faithful at our posts.

We may not rejoice once, but always. We may have our feasts of gratitude and love, and with the saints of olden times we may shout for joy. We may say with Isaiah, "Sing, O heavens! and be joyful, O earth! and break forth into singing, O mountains! for the Lord has comforted his people, and will have mercy upon his afflicted. Sing unto the Lord, for he has done excellent things! Cry out and shout, O inhabitant of Zion! for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee." And with Habakkuk let us say, "Although the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be on the vine; though the labor of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no food;

though the flocks shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls; yet we will rejoice in the Lord, and joy in the God of our salvation." "Let the heavens rejoice; let the earth be glad; let the sea roar; let the fields be joyful; let all the trees of the forest rejoice; let the hills be joyful together before the Lord, because he comes to bless his people. Bless the Lord, all his works, in all places of his dominions: bless the Lord, O my soul!"

## A MAN OF A HUNDRED YEARS.

A CORRESPONDENT of the Worcester (Massachusetts) Ægis has recently attended the celebration of the hundredth birthday of Malatia Mason, at Thompson, Connecticut. He gives the following interesting account of it:—

I never before had seen a person a hundred years old. This singular novelty created an interest not less singular, much heightened, no doubt, by the circumstance that this old man, and my little boy, who was with me, constituted the extremes of five generations. The occasion called together quite a concourse of the old gentleman's posterity, friends, and neighbors, and townsmen, and appropriate religious services were had at the Baptist Church in Thompson. Elder Grew preached from 2 Tim. iii. 6, 7, and 8. "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand," &c. The preacher stated that the old gentleman had, for three score years and ten, been a professor of religion; that the number of his surviving children was six; grand children, fifty-three; great grand children about one hundred and fifty; besides a number of great-great-grand children. Several branches of the old gentleman's family are settled in this commonwealth. Among others is the large family of Whites in Northbridge, and the family of Dr. Bullard of Sutton.

After the religious exercises of the occasion were over I endeavored to ascertain by what means, under God, in whom he had so early put his trust, this man of a hundred years had managed to live so long in the world. He informed me that he was born at Rehoboth; that he was brought up to the trade of a mason, and continued to work at it more or less until he was eighty years old; that when young he married "a worthy woman," by the name of Rebecca Miller, by whom he had twelve children, and whom he buried but a few years ago. He said he had always worked hard; had frequently walked ten miles in the morning and done his day's work.

Upon his being questioned as to his mode of living, he modestly said he had always aimed to be temperate; that when he used to word hard he drank a little spirit, but he never used tobacco *in any way; once in a while he smoked a little for amusement, but never a pipe full at a time.* He is a person small in stature, thick set, and has to this day a good head of hair, and a fine bright eye. The most striking characteristic of his mind was that of *equanimity and cheerfulness;* and herein undoubtedly consists the main secret by which the subtle machinery of life has been so long kept in motion.

## MILLENNIUM--*No. III.*——INNOVATIONS.

IN these days I find that many are afraid of innovations, and much opposed to them; especially in things which concern the kingdom of the Lord Jesus and its prosperity. But why all this? Is it because they are afraid that truth will fail in the earth—that the cause of Christ will suffer—that sinners will go down to hell? or is it something else? And do not they, who are all so much alarmed lest innovations should be made, manifest the same spirit and exhibit the same character that the Jews did in the days of Jesus and the Apostles? Were not they afraid of innovations in matters of religion? They certainly were: but why? That is the question. I answer, the very reason why *they* were so much afraid of the innovations which were made by Christ and his followers, was this—they and their fathers had made very great innovations on the religion which had been revealed from heaven by God himself, through the instrumentality of Moses, and the succeeding Prophets. Had they been candid, honest men, they would not have been afraid of the light—they would not have feared the strictest scrutiny.

The Jews are still afraid of innovations: and this is the grand hindrance to their conversion. Mahometans and heathens too are opposed to innovations in things of religion: and why? Not because they have truth on their side, but because they love that darkness with which they are surrounded, and hate the light of truth because their *deeds are evil.*

No people have been guilty of greater innovations on the religion of Jesus Christ, than those of the Roman Catholics; yet none have ever raised a greater *hue and cry* against innovations than they. They have persecuted many millions even unto death, on the ground of innovations; they have done it for ages, and they manifest the same spirit to this day. Witness the manner in which our missionaries and their converts have been treated in Palestine—witness the thunders of the Vatican against the Bible Societies and Bible men; yes, witness the frequent murders in Ireland by Catholic mobs to this day. This is because they are unwilling that innovations should be made on *their* religion—not the *Lord's*, but *their own.*

But, sir, I ask if any improvement can be made in any thing without innovation? Can the true and living christian "grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," without change? Can he constantly grow wiser and better without continual change? Surely not; and what is change but innovation?

Again, I would ask, Can the *promises and prophecies* that have gone before ever be fulfilled without great innovations? Must they not be made as the millennial glory nearer shines? Do ministers and christians suppose that *they know* as much of God, and feel the *power* of godliness as much as the people will who shall live in that happy day when the light of the *Moon* shall be as the light of the *Sun*—when the light of *one* day shall be as the light of *seven* days? and when "*Holiness to the Lord* shall be written upon the *bells* of the *horses?*" Are *we* as holy, as humble, as charitable, as spiritually

minded as *they* will be? And why need many run to and fro, and knowledge to be increased?

But, sir, let us take the several denominations of christians as we now find them—say, the Episcopalians, the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians: they are all very jealous over their rights or privileges—they are very tenacious of creeds and their forms; but if great innovations are not made amongst them will their watchmen ever "see eye to eye?" And can the glories of the Millennium ever be realized on earth? And will the people of that day be governed by that narrow mind, that sectarian, contracted, selfish, worldly spirit which characterize all the churches of the present day? Will they waste their lives in endless speculations and doubtful theories, and neglect prayer and practical godliness as we now do? If not, great innovations must be made.

Again, is not the christian religion, as it is now taught—believed—practised, almost any thing, or every thing, rather than the religion which was taught and believed, and which shone in life and conversation in the days of Paul? Who believes, and prays, and prevails in prayer as the christians did in those days? Who is now willing to deny himself and take "joyfully the spoiling of his goods," as did the christians of that time? Who can be found in these days that could wish himself "accursed from Christ for his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh?" Were the christians of those times as much in love with earthly things as we are? Did they delight as much in gay attire, in lascivious pampering of the body, and in an elegant, expensive parade, as christians of the present day? Did they affect the fine gentleman? Were they mere beaux and belles? If not, did they much resemble professors of the present age?

Again: is the same doctrine taught now which was then proclaimed? Is it not plain matter of fact, that the grand topics of apostolic preaching are but little thought of now, while a thousand speculations are advanced of which an Apostle never dreamed.—The religion of that day consisted of principle, heavenly principle, reduced to living, ardent, persevering practice. Is it so now? Does not the religion of the present day consist more in opinion than practice? Is it not the custom of the present age to adopt a set of opinions, make little advancement in the knowledge of God, refrain (*not always*) from grosser acts of wickedness, and attend to a few *forms of godliness*, while the heart is full of every thing but love to God and man? And is not this *called* the religion of Jesus Christ? I will not say there are exceptions; for if there were none, the world might sink at once to hell: but, I ask, is not this the fashion or custom which widely prevails in the churches of the present day? If any shall answer in the negative, let them answer by practice, and the answer will be, so far as they are concerned, both good and true.

If these things be so, (and the world cannot but see that they are so,) is there not the utmost need of vast amendment? Most certainly. But the amendments which God requires can never be made

without vast innovations. The world must be turned "upside down;" the churches must be shaken, sifted, and purified; the watchmen must blow the trumpet, not with uncertain, but with significant sound; they must blow it loud and long—they must learn to be ministers, and nothing but ministers of Jesus Christ, or the world itself will do as it has done for ages, it will empty almost all its contents into hell!

Innovations must be made—reform must, of necessity, take place—great changes must be introduced; they must overspread the world: for the world must be converted. Yes, the knowledge of the Lord must cover the earth as the waters do the sea. It is desirable that innovations should be made, that changes very great should come. I know, very well, that troubles great and many will attend the mighty revolution which the world must shortly undergo; but let them come—let us look to God for help, and arm ourselves for the conflict—let us acquit ourselves "like men," follow the Captain of our Salvation, fight the battles of the Lord, and come off more than conquerors, through him that loved us. Now let us endure hardships, as good soldiers, and wear the brighter crown. Light afflictions will increase our "eternal weight of glory," beyond the grave: and there is much truth in the ancient proverb, "No cross, no crown."

I said, it is desirable that innovations should be made—made in those things *called religious*, as well as other things: I say so still: and why? Because the good, the infinite, eternal good which God has promised, can never come, can never be enjoyed, without innovations. People are not prepared to receive those blessings. Nay, much of the good which God has in store, consists in the very changes which shall take place. Glorious things are spoken of the city (i. e. the church) of our God: but they can never be fulfilled, unless the church is revolutionized. She is not now prepared to receive them. She must come up out of the wilderness—she must learn to be separate from the world, remembering that its friendship is enmity with God, or she can never receive those glorious things.

Why, then, are so many ministers and churches afraid of innovations? Are ministers afraid they shall lose their livings? Are they persecuted, as Jesus, and Paul, and Luther, and Whitfield, have been? Why are the churches so much afraid of innovations? Are they afraid their slumbers will be broken? Or are they afraid they shall be obliged to dissolve their partnership with the world? Are they afraid they shall be necessitated to lay aside their gay equipage, their gewgaws, and all their extravagances in dress and other things? Are they afraid they shall be obliged to deny themselves, take up the cross, follow Jesus daily, watch, pray, and live, as for eternity? Or are they afraid the zeal of innovators will put them to shame, and that they shall be obliged to forsake all for Christ, bear the cross, or else be exposed to themselves and to the world, in the light or character of mere hypocrites, having no more religion than is requisite for a decent or comfortable standing in and with the world?

Sir, I wish you to publish this, or produce a better article on the same subject: for something of the kind is greatly needed.

*New York Evangelist.*

## ELDER TAYLOR'S "CAMPBELLISM EXPOSED."

I RECEIVED the following communication after my review of Elder John Taylor's pamphlet was printed off. I did not think, nor do I now think, the pamphlet worthy of a notice as long as an ordinary obituary. But there are other matters in connexion with it deserving of more attention. These I have glanced at in my review. But the following communication I feel inclined to insert for the following reasons:—

1. The writer and I never exchanged an idea upon the subject; he saw not my review, and I saw not his, till mine was, as it now is, in print. The remarkable coincidence in many essential remarks is a matter of interesting curiosity.

2. In the next place, he is no way interested in the controversy from any implication or personal feeling whatever.

3. He is a northern man, consequently *cool* and dispassionate; and being far from the scene of action, he is not instigated by any of those feelings which move those who are on the confines of the great theatre of war in Kentucky.

The impressions made upon his mind appear to be the natural operation of the pamphlet; and if he have expressed himself more pointedly than I, it will show how much self-denial I exercised in my strictures upon it. But the wise will see, and the inquisitive will learn more clearly from this reviewer, than before, the necessity of reform.

EDITOR.

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

AS might be foreseen, upon the ordinary grounds presented by the history of mankind, the "*Restoration*," &c. so faithfully and successfully advocated in the *Christian Baptist*, has from various quarters encountered opposition. The sectarians, impelled by the ingredients of their *nature*, hated the *matter* and the *manner* of the book. False friends, moral cowards, and hypocrites united in deploring the *spirit* in which it was conducted. They would have much preferred a tame, lame, and time-serving production, with a semblance of faithfulness, in the proportion of a grain of wheat to a bushel of chaff. "He is too sarcastic," says one; "Too bitter," says a second; "Would make a better Lawyer than a Divine," says a third; while all were compelled to confess, in a positive or negative mode, that he could not be refuted; that his arguments were logical and his positions scriptural; and that *somehow*, in all the invitations to discussion, or challenges to disputation upon the points set forth, the wisdom of the wise has failed them, and the courage of the mighty has come to nought. We have seen Christian Bishops, Drs. of Divinity, Editors of light-giving periodicals, and a host beside, making a mighty flourish when preparing to silence this "*voice crying in the wilderness.*" And what has been effected? Is

the truth defensible? Are these men paid for defending it? Are they bound by their special call to the work, to confute with scripture and solid learning this mighty gainsayer? According to their own confession, do they expect to stand before the Judge to answer for the discharge of this duty? And what, I again ask, has been effected? Why this much, and no more—they have now and then noticed an *insulated* statement made by the *Christian Baptist;* they have indulged in a few stale witticisms; they have insinuated, and equivocated, and changed ground; they have accused, lied, and perverted; and in all their proceedings DEMONSTRATED before the whole heavens that they could not defend themselves fairly and honorably; and that the *truths* pressed upon the public mind by A. Campbell were felt to be *truths*, and for *that* reason to be obscured, darkened, and vilified. lest the subjects of the clergy should acknowledge them to be true and from God.

This train of reflection was suggested by reading a filthy, ignorant, and mischievous pamphlet, published by *John Taylor* of Kentucky, which may be considered a FAIR specimen of the opposition to the work of God as defended in the *Christian Baptist* and now by the *Millennial Harbinger*. I do *not* intend a formal review of this abortion of the historian of "*Ten Baptist Churches*." No—the little work does not merit a regular notice; but it has suggested the following remarks, which may be useful to some.

I had long wished for some unquestionable specimen of the *effect* of the system of the Regular Baptists. And why? but that I was *almost* persuaded that the spirit and genius of their system was essentially different from the gospel of the grace of God. Now I am *altogether* convinced, that, as a sect, they have not the truth of the gospel among them; neither do they hold the institutions of Christ's kingdom, nor the order of the churches established by apostolic authority in the beginning. The pamphlet before us is a noble developement of the *spirit* and *efficacy* of the system, and PROVES that if peace and holiness be prerequisites to admission into the kingdom of glory, the plan, temper, order, and influence of the Regular Baptists, are not only not conducive to salvation, but directly and positively opposed to the attainment of meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light. Unless death, or he who hath the power of death, accomplish a miraculous change—that is, unless they do more in the production of holiness and in evolving the fruits of righteousness, than fifty years membership and preaching among the Regular Baptists—what must be the eternal destiny of such a spirit as that of Old John Taylor? Admit him into the family of the holy and perfect on high, breathing the spirit of his pamphlet, and with whom *could* he associate? If the New Testament be true, there is in the mansions of rest no kindred spirit. The proof of this is to be met with in every page, and is so palpable that the incongruity of *his* statements with gospel feeling must be discerned even by the worldling, if possessed of a common measure of intelligence and sensibility,

Without pretending to much propriety of arrangement in the *order*

of our remarks and specifications, it is necessary to premise that what we shall say of Elder John Taylor, is said, recognizing him as exemplifying the system to which he is attached—to which he was converted by William Marshall, and in consequence of which he became "a decided full bred Baptist." As respects the old man himself, personally, he has been sufficiently important among his fellow-wranglers, and is abundantly comfortable in his supposed eminence among the "Regulars," and it is to be feared has seldom heard the truth as concerns himself. We think it important *he* should be told it before he goes to render an account of his stewardship. But to the system:—

1. John Taylor evinces a desire to be thought possessed of a peculiar discernment of spirits. He *suspected* Campbell from his first interview; nay, more—Doctor Noel and he *strongly suspected* he was "deeply tinctured with Unitarianism." This was at the first interview; after hearing two discourses, in which the offence against orthodoxy consisted in enjoining family religion and the christian education of children without having said any thing, either way, upon the topic about which the suspicion was indulged. Ah! it requires an effort to repress the rising indignation at the conduct revealed by this PRECIOUS confession. Is this welcoming a christian brother and a fellow-laborer in the gospel? Is this the spirit cherished by the orthodox Regulars? It is worthy of remark that old John's tears trickled while Mr. Campbell was teaching, until he began a "full explanation of religion," and then Elder Taylor was "dried up as barren as the heath." This is no way peculiar to him. It is the *condition* of the sect. Their sensibilities are awake to the few things which SELFISHNESS has sanctified and appropriated to themselves; but a *full* explanation of the religion of the Holy Oracles is always able to dry up the fountain of their consolation, and fill them with angry and envious suspicions against the man who causes them to hear it. John Taylor may *tremble* at the reflection, that while he can enjoy a partial selection of statements upon religion, all that is necessary to dry him up and make him ready for the burning is that the *whole* book should be true—and that by it *as a whole*, he must be judged. We have always considered this claim to special discernment as an index pointing to spiritual pride and its kindred grovelling passions. It is abundantly to be met with among the Regulars, and is supposed, among them, to be *great boldness in the faith*, and deserving of all respect and veneration on the part of the less highly favored. "Sure I ought to know," bespeaks the whole attainment in humility to which the individual has arrived.

2. John Taylor, as the embodied spirit of the system, evinces the disposition to "judge another's servant," in the full perfection of that ungodly temper. His utmost stretch of charity cannot discover that Campbell has any "saving religion." When speaking of D. Parker, of Illinois, he intimates the want of religion in him too. Compares young Jacob to "an unclean spirit," and accuses Morton of never having felt the power of godliness—mentions John Smith, and finding

him in the *bad* company of a *reformer*, says all the evil he can of him —charges Joseph Hewett with parade, and, for want of other materials, *supposes* what evil he can of him. He insinuates that Mr. Campbell did some mischief, though he cannot tell what, before leaving the Presbyterians, and acknowledges HE KNOWS NOTHING AGAINST CAMPBELL'S MORAL DEPORTMENT; though he is evidently sorry he does not, and that "tears of joy would trickle," if he could, with the semblance of truth, accuse him of something wicked and unholy!! But stop! We have adduced evidence in *savage* plenty to prove the spirit of old John, and his sect, to be full of all malice and uncharitableness. Is there a man of common moral feeling and social decency who does not repudiate with disgust the spirit he exemplifies? Will the world believe it possible that an aged disciple, in any sect, bearing the (much abused) name of *Christianity*, could express a hope that the discharge of certain public duties, as a citizen of Virginia, may have inspired a taste for political life, strong enough to alienate the object of his malice from the church of Christ? Is this the man whose heart melts so readily at the very idea of sinners being converted? Is it the man who says, "Conversion by God is not a half-handed work," while he doubts the *reality* of the revival at Nicholasville? I cannot help pitying this poor, bigoted, hard-spirited old man!!

3. John Taylor, as aforesaid, in perfect consistency with his sect, while serving the basest ends and passions, professes to be actuated by a special desire to be at peace with all, and to avoid hurting the feelings or character of any. O, yes! he writes with "great sorrow of heart," and "desires not to say one uncharitable word of any soul alive." Alas! does not such a declaration, taken in connexion with a tithe of his pamphlet, illustrate the fearful influence of his system and plan. He either believes this of himself, and if so, must be *mentally* infatuated —or he does not believe it, and so must be *morally* and hopelessly blinded. Will it be believed that an aged minister of the christian religion, who has enjoyed the sanctifying, enlightening influences of fifty or sixty years' study and enforcement of the Holy Oracles, could think so well of himself in the act of exhausting the resources of malice and the vocabulary of Billingsgate? But to the proof. He describes the Reformers as exhibiting the "brazen impudence of the race of goats"—using "log-rolling" to fill the pulpit—as "filthy scum"—employing "disgusting bravado"—and believing in "Phariseeism gospelized"—these reformers (described by name) are "headlong men," inculcating "blithe merriment" at baptism, instituting gospel feasts fitly denominated "war dances"—"buzzard-men"—"murderers (as Herod) exulting"—"outlandish renegadoes"—"cocked and primed for war"—and "merry as a cricket." Now, dear reader, is not that a PURE speech, worthy of a man who for fifty years has been imbibing the spirit of his namesake, the beloved disciple—worthy of one who considers himself a special guardian of "points of order" in the house of God? Is it at all wonderful that such a tongue should call the apostolic *order*, ordained of God for all his churches, by the name of "*poor, little, mean thing*"? He compares Campbell to Daniel's

he-goat, and Mr. Parker to another goat—insinuates that certain "helps" employed by Rice, (who it seems is a most outrageous fellow, and a stickler for good order,) to ascertain what was order, and what was not, were guilty of *craft*—ascribes to Jacob the Younger the vile and mean motive of wishing to secure his hire of ninety dollars as the spring of his action—directly slanders both Jacobs under the pretence of praying for them—considers the ignorant, self-willed, self-conceited Morton, as entitled to this recommendation (though he be chaffy) that he was unsound before he fell into Campbell's hands—likens young Jacob to a "calf"—"beautiful"—and a "curse to the people"—as, indeed, Campbell, Parker, Creath, and all concerned are declared to be "a curse to this ill-fated generation"—denominates Campbell's views and brethren "filthy lumber"—distinguished by your "loud laughter" and "want of humility"—describes their "whole religion as mirth and ease," and nothing but "INFIDELITY UNDER A MASK!!" But we are tired and disgusted.

Now, christian reader, are these the breathings of christian charity? Is it *possible* that such a man told the truth when he professed kindness for all and zeal for God's glory? Does this look like the Apostle John's namesake, forsooth? If he *thought* he spoke truly when he professed to love peace, has not his system utterly blinded and besotted his understanding? Has not his religion palsied and dethroned his moral sense? But we forbear. As respects the style of illustration, if it were not for spiders, flies, cockatrice eggs, creeping things, man-eaters, he-goats, hogs, and other insects, we cannot conceive what old John would do. True, he is "panting for eternity," and has infused much spirit and *life* into his sketches. But, Oh! when we think of the *moral* question!—the misrepresentation of another's sentiments—the attempt at cruel and bitter sarcasm, at the expense of those he calls "brothers"—the hypocritical pretensions to the love of the brethren and of the churches—the evident *consciousness* that he was sinning against the law of kindness, candor, and charity, in the very act of writing; and above all, that the old man should hope to "die more peaceably," in consequence of having done, what men of piety and good sense feel, could only embitter a dying hour. All, all prove the darkness created by his system, and the fearful state of delusion and ruin in which it leaves its subjects, advocates, and admirers! If this be the operation of the *plan* of the Regular Baptists, "O, my soul! come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united."

4. John Taylor, as aforesaid, exhibits an example of *ignorance* in a professed, long-tried, successful preacher of the Baptist faith, which could hardly be *suspected* even in this day of clerical suspicion and jealousy. We need not specify all the language of Ashdod which marks his inattention to the style of the Bible. We were prepared to meet with such phrases as "stated preacher," "monthly meetings," though it rather exceeded our calculations that where so *orderly* a system as Mr. Taylor's prevails, a church of Christ should be a *whole year without communion!* We also suppose there is something *local*

in the distinction between "question of trespass" and "question of order." But it grieved us, and makes us ashamed withal, to find the scriptures when quoted uniformly misapplied—and quoted at random, without regard to the mind of God in the context. This criticism may sound "Jewish," but we must adhere to it, though it *prove* the hitherto invincible ignorance of our author respecting the scope and design of the inspired volume. Mr. Taylor is a teacher of christianity—of great experience, and long standing—an author too—a historian and polemic. Well! he evidently considers "doctrine as of small importance compared with points of order!" He thinks he has refuted the "ancient order," &c. by saying it existed one hundred years ago in the mind of Glass or Sandeman. He gravely admonishes Jacob Creath of the responsibility incurred by saying the Holy Scriptures are sufficient of themselves, without a humanly invented creed, to make a man of God perfect. He thinks it "outlandish mockery to administer your Lord's Supper in the open air." He would have us believe the "Apostle's creed" is of divine inspiration, and that the "decrees" of the Apostles of Jesus Christ are on a level with rules and regulations appended, by the wisdom of such men as himself, to the Minutes of an Association. He denounces reformers as possessed of the spirit of Catholics, because they each had a New Testament and read it openly! Yes, reader, these are the views ("*my views*," he says,) of a Bishop of 50 years' experience, enjoying the advantages of the purest church upon the earth; so pure as to defy reformation—a man who feels that his conscience constrains him to spread his light, and knowledge, and *love* before the world, in hopes of dying more peaceably after enlightening his age. I need not say Mr. C. pretends to no originality of views, but avows and feels his indebtedness to Christ and his Apostles for all he knows in the matter of the christian religion. But it must also be said, that it displays the *inutility* of the system, when, after all these advantages, ignorance so gross continues, and notions so crude prevail. Indeed, no better proof of the *incapacity* of old John's plan to produce peace and holiness is necessary, than the history of the janglings and quarrels that he himself describes, and with all his affectation of sorrow, manifestly enjoys. Yes! yes! the old Regular Baptists are in their element, when making and managing difficulties, speaking speeches, and, like Rice, "running away with the reins" of a church. What a degrading spectacle, by the old man's own showing, are their church meetings, their discipline, and business. No man of good feeling could continue among them, and no prudent man of good character could safely deposit his standing among men, in their keeping. The historic details of such matters are low slander; and O! how degraded the people that can be gratified and interested by such narratives. No doubt Mr. Taylor KNOWS his people. If the reader can imagine a body of people, of both sexes, met to wrangle upon questions of heresy and moral character; defying the Moderator in their outrageous discussions; electioneering poor Negro slaves for the purpose of carrying a point; exhibiting the worst tempers and lowest manners; and their meeting

prefaced with singing hymns, and saying prayers—then he can imagine a *church*, a Regular Baptist church, doing business under the eye and influence of John Taylor, who writes and publishes an essay on "points of order!" And has it come to this? Yea, times are changed, wofully changed, since (as Mr. Taylor tells us, as a matter of *pure* revelation) Adam had an *angelic soul!* What teachers! *Are these the enemies of the Restoration?* O that they individually may adopt Mr. Taylor's prayer, p. 31; and O that God would hear and answer it! "If I can do no good in the church of Christ, I pray God to keep me from doing harm! And all the people shall say, *Amen!*

AJAX.

## EDUCATION—*No. III.*

IN our last essay it was asked, "Can a person love, fear, or hate a person of whom he is perfectly ignorant?" *No* is the answer which must be given. The opinion which shall be formed of a stranger depends upon his introduction to us; and according to our opinion of him will our affections and feelings towards him be. Every thing, therefore, depends upon the representations of the character of God which shall first be presented to the infant mind. Teach an infant that God is cruel, and it will hate him. Teach an infant that God is kind and benevolent, and it will love him. A child may be made to hate or love its own natural father; and if the scriptures say nothing to the contrary, we would suppose, from reason and analogy, that it might be made to love or hate its heavenly Father, according to the representation which is presented to its mind. Let us, then, inquire what arguments christianity furnishes us with to produce love to God? Or does christianity authorize us so to represent God to the mind of an infant as to beget in its mind confidence in God and love to him?

The Apostle John teaches us that "God is love." This was his fundamental principle. This was his essential attribute of God as revealed through Jesus Christ. This developement of the Divinity was not made before the mission of Jesus. "No man has seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, who came from the bosom of the Father, has made him known." And what did Jesus say of his Father? 'God so loved the world as to give his richest, and best, and dearest gift, his *only* begotten Son, that *whosoever* believes in him might not *perish*, but have *everlasting life*." This is the strongest proof that "God is love."

Now, from these premises, might not a parent say to her infant, 'My child, you love me because you lived upon my breast—because you repose upon my bosom—because you find protection in my arms and every enjoyment in my smiles. But there is one who is much kinder to you and who loves you much better than I. That being whom you have so often heard me call *my heavenly Father;* to whom you have so often heard me ascribe praise for his goodness; to whom I look for protection by night and comfort by day; from whom you hear me continually implore blessings for you and for myself and for all mankind; it is from him you received life at first, and from him every blessing and every comfort you enjoy, descends. He gave you to me and me to you. See how great and how good he is. He made the Sun, the Moon and the Stars. He gave to these luminaries all the beauties, and charms, and powers which they possess. He made the earth and the waters, and all that inhabit them. He makes the grass to grow, and produces food for man and beast. Every thing you can desire to eat and every thing you can desire to drink he has bestowed upon us. For you and I, and all our race, he has created all that you see, and all that you know. And though he lives far beyond the reach of our sight, his eyes see us, and over us he watches by day and by night.

'When he made man at first he made every thing for him, and gave him a right to use every thing for his comfort, and only kept from him the fruit of

one single tree, that our first father and mother might never forget that he was their Father and their God. But they would take it, and they did rebel against his goodness and his will; and having rebelled, he was induced to turn them out from his presence. He withdrew from their sight and left them to themselves.

'Thus all children have, like you, been born in darkness and ignorance of him; and having no knowledge of him, are not inclined to converse with him nor to know him. But, my child, let me tell you that when he had tried and proved to every creature what a terrible thing it is to transgress his good will and pleasure; and after he had given mankind time to prove what they could learn and do without his aid, he had still such compassion and kindness for them all, as to send his only Son, who was always in his bosom, caressed and beloved infinitely more than I have loved you.

'He sent this his only Son to let us know that he would receive us back into his favor; and upon putting ourselves under his government, and submitting to do what he bids us, he has promised to forgive all our faults, and to make us live for ever, and be forever happy in his presenee. When we had all forgotten him and transgressed his will, he sent his Son not only to teach us his character and our dependence upon him, but also to suffer all kinds of afflictions, and pain, and death on our account, that he might cause us to love him, and that we might be made happy with him forever in heaven.

'Every thing contrary to love he abhors, and nothing that is not contrary to ove is displeasing in his sight. All offences against any of his creatures are offences against him; for as he made all creatures, he is kind to all and is the preserver of all. You see he makes the grass to grow for all kinds of cattle, and sends his favors to every thing that lives. Now as he is so good to all, he cannot be pleased with any one who does an injury to any of his creatures. These offences against our own species and against the animals which God has given us for our assistance and comfort, are what he has called *sins*. Now you know you could not love any one who would injure me, because you love me. Just so God cannot love any one who injures his fellow-creatures, because he is benevolent to all. The reason, then, that sin is offensive in his sight, is because it is injurious to ourselves and to our fellow-creatures. Hence, as God is love, he must dislike sin because it injures both the offender and the offended. You know that if you should get angry with your sister, and only say an angry word to her, that word grieves her, and your passion pains and grieves yourself. So that sin is injurious to the offender and the offended.

'You will, my child, perceive that as God is love, and that as he is kind and benevolent to all, so he affectionately and complacently loves them that love him; and, even to the froward and perverse, he is always good and benevolent, though he cannot approve their ways; but his goodness bestowed upon them is designed to bring them to reformation of life.

'In hating and in punishing sin, you see, my dear child, that God is amiable. For were he not affectionate and kind to all his creatures, he would not prohibit offences nor punish for them. But as you see and feel the more you love me the more you are grieved to see me pained, and the more you dislike every person and thing which injures me or gives me grief. So it is with God.

'The pains of body which you feel, and the grievances which you suffer, are kindly designed to correct your views and reform your behaviour, that you may be brought home to God. You would, in this cloudy and dark world, soon forget God and happiness, if you were not thus kept in mind of him and of yourself. God never forgets you, therefore he endeavors to keep you in mind of him—sometimes by his smiles when you please him, and sometimes by a frown when you forget him.

'You see that I have to frown upon you when you imperil yourself by departing from me; but when you keep my counsel and keep in my presence, I smile upon you. Now as all my actions proceed from love to you, so all the actions of God towards you proceed from love. But I will tell you at another

time how much love God exhibited to you in sending his Son, and also I will tell you of some things which his Son said concerning little children like you."

So far, for the present, in illustration of the arguments which christianity puts into our mouths to reconcile our children to God, or rather to prevent that obstinate enmity of which we often complain as an attribute of human nature. But I must beg for indulgence and for the candor of my readers while I attempt to call forth their inquiries upon this subject. We desire to give a new impulse to their minds on a subject as dear to themselves as the salvation of their own souls. EDITOR.

## HINTS TO REFORMERS.

WE are engaged in the greatest, noblest, and most blissful enterprize—an enterprize which has called forth the energies, and filled the hearts of the greatest and best men of every age. From Enoch, who foretold the dreadful and sublime consummation—and Noah who proclaimed reformation to the antediluvians—there has been a succession of men in every age, to whose efforts for personal, family, and national reformation the moral health and happiness of society are justly attributed. But manifold as have been the reformations of past ages, there is need for one of a more elevated character; of more extensive range and more radical tendencies than any attempted or achieved since the Grand Apostacy.

But what now presses upon us is the necessity of reformation among the reformers in the manner of carrying on this reformation. We have felt the necessity for this for some time, and daily experience and observation proclaim the necessity of it. Our efforts have been too much in the spirit of the times. From necessity, and not from choice, have we been compelled to stimulate the attention of the people by such appeals and addresses as they were prepared to feel and understand. Dreadful diseases require dreadful remedies. An audience has been obtained, and consequently the means to obtain it are no longer necessary. We must, then, change our course, and fight not with the weapons of the Babel-builders and Babel-repairers. And perhaps we should never call them any thing more characteristic than *our opponents*. All personalities are to be proscribed on our side of the controversy, and every thing which savors of the spirit of Antichrist and of this world to be laid aside. Whatever will not carry conviction to the heads and hearts of our hearers or readers—whatever is not necessary to prove, illustrate, and confirm some great proposition, ought not to be heard or seen.

Let not the spirit nor the practice of the belligerent opponents beguile the reformers into their spirit and style.

If an opponent call me knave, impostor, deceiver, or hypocrite, it will avail me nothing to return these compliments to him, for this will not prove me innocent. It might in some circumstances prove me guilty as the accuser, or the accuser guilty as myself; but my proving him guilty will not prove me innocent. By good words and good works let us put to silence ignorant and wicked men. Let humility, self-denial, and a meek and quiet spirit adorn the ministrations of the reforming brethren. Let there be manifest, an undissem-

bled love to all the saints and benevolence to all men. Truth and love, arguments and kindness, are the only useful auxiliaries in this warfare. By truth and charity we conquer.

There are some opponents who ought not to have a reply. We have been condescending to an extreme in noticing all. This is no longer necessary. And I ask, How could a christian reply to the *Baptist Chronicle* and some other things of a similar character? There is no argument to which to reply; and to offer *billingsgate for billingsgate*, or *curses for curses*, is not compatible with the will of our King; besides it is altogether superfluous: for no man of reflection can or will say that there is any thing in such pieces which wise men will regard. It is enough to quote occasionally some pieces from these works, *and let them* SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES.

Let the reforming brethren give the people testimony, argument, and evidence; and let them, in the spirit of the gospel of love and benevolence, appear before the public. Then they will find advocates in the consciences of all men, and friends and allies in the best feelings of the human heart. EDITOR.

## REGENERATION—*No. IV.*

AFTER a few general observations, having stated that he only was regenerated or born of water and spirit, who, being previously begotten by the spirit, came forth from the water as from the womb, we offered in our last a few remarks upon the nature of God, the Primary Agent, as revealed to us in the scriptures; upon man's incapacity to discover God in his own nature, that is to say, as a Spirit; and upon the necessity thence arising that God should present himself in such a manner to man that he by the means of his senses might be enabled to detect his presence and his character. We then concluded by noticing briefly that exhibition of Him, which immediately relates to our subject, *to wit*—God manifest in the flesh, our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom God dwelt, reconciling a world unto himself in forgiving their sins; by the reception of the testimony concerning whom man is begotten again, quickened, regenerated, has his affections elevated above the fleeting pleasures of animal life to those true, superior, and celestial delights which are to remain forever; becomes exalted to the dignity of a son of God, and rejoices in the prospect of exchanging his gross, earthy, and decaying tabernacle for a spiritual, incorruptible, and immortal body.

We come now to consider the subject man. *Gnothi seauton*, (know thyself,) said the wisest of the wise. What are we? What shall we be? Whence came we? Whither do we go? are important and interesting questions. That we may know what man is, it is necessary that we should first discover what he was. Let us examine the place of his abode.

In the garden of Eden the soul of man was pure. The refreshing dews of heaven descended into its bosom. The grateful streams with which it was watered flowed murmuring along its flowery bor-

ders. Living verdure, richer than velvet, composed its carpeting. There the Lord God had caused to grow every tree that was pleasant to the sight and good for food. Nothing that could gratify desire—nothing that could contribute to continue happiness were wanting there. The prolific earth was pleased to pour her accumulated treasures into the lap of Paradise. No imagination can paint the delightful groves, the peaceful bowers, the sweet blossoms, the delicious fruits that adorned that blessed abode where the vegetable and animal creation rejoiced together in new-born beauty. Nothing that could cause pain—no thorns, no thistles—sprung from the untainted soil. There no storms raged. The sun diffused his tempered beams through skies forever serene. The gentle breezes, perfuming their wings with grateful odors, wafted in silken dalliance, ten thousand sounds to the listening ear. There the bountiful Creator condescended to manifest his presence, and harmony and peace smiled upon every scene, and sanctified every enjoyment.

In the midst of the garden, equally conspicuous and equally beautiful, at least in appearance, stood two trees which presided over its destinies. The tree of life, itself the emblem, and its fruit the reward of innocence; and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, while untouched, untasted, not interfering with the blissful enjoyments of Eden, yet ready to afford to guilt its food, and its punishment also.

The garden had one "to dress it and to keep it." It was to be dressed that it might exhibit to the best advantage its native charms. It was to be kept with care in all its loveliness. No weeds were there to be eradicated—no fresh beauties could be added. As a reward for his attention the superintendant was permitted freely to partake of all the blessings it was capable of affording—its limpid streams, its odoriferous flowers, its golden fruits; to reign supreme over all that had life upon the earth; and, as long as innocence continued, permitted from the fruit of the tree of life to renew his youth like the eagle's, and to secure to himself a perpetuity of enjoyment.

Adam was not at first in the garden of Eden. It harmonized with his character, and became his habitation. After the earth was created God selected a particular portion of it, and adorned it with the varied beauties and grateful manifestations of vegetable life. "The Lord planted a garden eastward in Eden, and out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that was pleasant to the eye, and good for food." God formed man first of the dust of the ground, and afterwards communicated to him animal life with all its powers and desires, its passions and its charms. The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.

As under the reign of the tree of life nothing hateful or pernicious was produced in the garden, yet the easy access to the forbidden tree denoted the nice balance in which its destiny was suspended; so in

Adam, though capable of disobedience, no evil principles or passions had any place under the dominion of innocence.

Adam, also, had been created in the image of God. He possessed a pure intellectual principle which enabled him to become acquainted with God. To his spirit was given the government of his passions and capacities. There were no pernicious principles to be eradicated—there were no new powers to be implanted. It was his occupation to preserve his original purity, and to exhibit the excellencies of his nature for his own enjoyment, and the glory of his Creator. His reward was the pleasure arising from the constant gratification of innocent desire—from intimate connexion with the Author of all his joys, and from the absence of any fear that his happiness would be diminished or destroyed.

There is another resemblance. As through the genial influence of the rays of the Sun, and the vivifying power of moistening streams, the garden of Eden was fitted to afford equally to noxious and unseemly plants, and to useful and beautiful productions, if the seeds of both were once introduced, that common nourishment which these changed into delightful and salutary fruits; and those had the power of appropriating to themselves and converting into that which was disgusting and injurious, as under the operation of the fixed and still existing laws of nature in the same soil if once planted there, the Rose of Sharon without a thorn, and the poisonous nettle could flourish together, the deadly nightshade could stretch its gloomy arms, and the spotless lily open her silver chalice; so Adam was constituted that evil principles once received might flourish, and the bosom that now glowed with peaceful emotions of joy, love, and gratitude, could ere long be forced to yield to the stormy passions of hatred, envy, and ambition.

DISCIPULUS.

*For the Millennial Harbinger.*

## TRUE HOLINESS.

HOW wonderful the Author of the Universe! His first thought embodied is the *material world;* his second, *redemption;* and his last, *ineffable glory, the heaven of heavens*, where all necessity for the Sun and temples is annihilated, nature and religion, and sense and faith, from which they are derived, being wholly swallowed up in the eternal glories of God and the Lamb.

In nature, where we have the primeval discovery of his divine powers, our Heavenly Father has displayed all beauty, grandeur, sublimity, order, variety, harmony, and immensity; and if, after the lapse of six thousand years, the combined wisdom of the great, the wise, and the good, has failed to redeem much of the philosophy, mechanics, mathematics, optics, &c. of this outer temple, who shall reach to the height and depth, and length and breadth of his redemption, where mind takes the place of matter, and morality of physical power? May we not say here what David once said, "Thine, O Lord, is the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all

things that are in the heavens and in the earth are thine. Thine they are, and thou art exalted as head over all. Who shall not fear and glorify thy name, for thou only art holy?"

But it is now two thousand years since redemption was accomplished and promulged, and yet men comprehend scarce its first principles. All is, even now, confusion in reference to this love of God, and glory of Jesus. Who, then, shall speak, shall dare to speak of heaven, where the principles both of sense and faith are done away for others which we are doubtless possessed of, but which can be developed only after we have "shuffled off this mortal coil," and are born into heaven, where dwells the only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light, which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, or can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. It is ours, however, to trace *haud passibus equis*, the footsteps of our Father, our glorious Father, from *nature* to *redemption*, and from thence again to *heaven*, where he is beheld in all the flashing lustre of a sardine and of a jasper stone, clothed with an emerald-like rainbow, and surrounded with the thrones and dominions of heaven, the lamps of fire, the godlike spirits of his presence, the glassy laver, and the all-seeing *beings* that bear his throne, and that cease not day nor night, saying, "Holy! holy! holy! Lord God Almighty! who wast, and art, and art to come!" which hallelujah is sustained by that of the representatives of all the saints, who, casting down their crowns before the throne, say, "Worthy art thou, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power; for thou hast created all things, and by thy will they are and were created! Amen!"

It is said in the law of Christ, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," and the Spirit certainly means what he says. It behooves us, therefore, for our own souls salvation's sake, well to understand and steadily to practise *holiness*. "Be ye holy, for I the Lord am holy." Great argument! This epithet "*holy*" is applied in scripture to the Father, to the Son, and to the Spirit. Jesus says, "*Holy Father;*" Christ himself is called "the *Holy* One of God," "the *Holy* One," and "*Holy* Child Jesus;" and we all are ordered to be baptized into the name of the *Holy* Spirit. The angels are called *holy*, and so also the Prophets, with the Apostles, and all the Saints, who are entitled the "*holy* nation." O, then, let the holy nation act holily! Let us reform, and reform, and reform, until we have put on the whole new man, which after the image of God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

*Definition.*—"True holiness" is defined by a great scripturean, "to consist in a conformity to the nature, character, and will of God, whereby a saint is distinguished from the unrenewed world, and is not actuated by their principles and precepts, nor governed by their maxims and customs." It is this conformity to him who is good, and this separation from all that is evil, that obtains for men and angels the name of *holy*, and we are indeed and in truth holy in proportion as we advance in this separation and conformity

In regard to this conformity to the character of God, it is said, "Be ye, therefore, perfect, as your Father who is in heaven is perfect"—i. e. Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them who arraign you and prosecute you. And, reader, mark me, if you are conformed to God by these practices, two things are true in you: Christ has become to you sanctification, and you are the child of your Heavenly Father, who makes his sun to rise on bad and good, and sends rain on just and unjust, If the case is otherwise, it is a miserable one. Alas! for you!

The practice of christianity is all holiness, and holiness is the very fruit of the Spirit, which again is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth. Dare we, then, hope to see God without holiness? or can a man seriously believe in the death of Christ for sin, and yet practise it, and neglect holiness? When Ahab sent for Elisha to deliver himself on the question of peace and war, the Prophet, filled with a noble indignity for the delinquency of that apostate Prince, swore by the life of God and by the life of his own soul, saying, "Were it not for the presence of Jehosaphat King of Judah, I would not look toward thee nor see thee." Reader, does your practice of holiness embolden you to hope for the fellowship of such a spirit as Elisha's? When the King of Sodom offered a *bonus* to the Father of the Faithful, that great man declared that he had lifted up his hand to the Most High God that he would not take from a thread to a shoelatchet of his property. Imitate this lofty reliance upon God, and you will be the child of Abraham who was the friend of God. Mark the dignity of Paul's course! In prosperity and adversity always rejoicing. I do not believe that a wicked person has courage enough to hope for the company of such spirits as these. What! do you think of meeting all the good and wise, and great too, that have feared God since the world began, from Abel to the resurrection of the dead? The holy women of olden time, the mothers of Israel, of chastened eye; Sarah, and Deborah, and Hannah, and Elizabeth, and Mary; the Prophets and Apostles; the great Generals, Gideon and Barak, and David, and Sampson, and Jepthah? Can we think of Moses without veneration, or of Isaiah without fearing God? Can we dare the rebukes of the brazen-faced Ezekiel, or fail to tremble before the thunders of Jeremiah? Let it encourage us, then, reader, to holiness—to remember, that we have come to a notable institution—"to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of messengers, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of All, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the New Institution, and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaks better things than that of Abel." Wherefore we having received a kingdom that cannot be moved, let us have gratitude whereby we may worship God acceptably with reverence and religious fear. For even our God is a consuming fire.

Love is of the essence of true holiness, and better than the united tongues of men and angels. Let us, then, love; but whom shall we

love? The answer is easy: Parents, love one another. Is this difficult? And both of you love your children. Without this your religion is a mask. Love the brethren; love all men; and above all, love God and Christ, and approve it by doing what they have bid you; and when the strong-lunged angel shall sound the retreat of the universe, and all the stars begin to march—when he shall blow open all the tombs, and heaven and earth begin to flee away, the Judge will pronounce a blessing upon your head, and, introducing you into heaven, say, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter you into the joy of your Lord; for I was hungry and you fed me, thirsty and you gave me drink, naked and you clothed me, sick and in prison and you came unto me." This, reader, is the practice and reward of true holiness. Amen. PHILIP.

## ARGUMENTUM AD HOMINEM.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

IN reading Mr. A. W. Clopton's strictures upon the preface of the Christian Baptist, and particularly the passages which I sha l quote, I am reminded of an incident which took place last October at the Dover Association. The passages are these: "It gives much additional force to this view of the subject, that not only those who are illiterate, but also the most learned and pious men of this day, admire and love the Pilgrim's Progress. In further illustration of this fact, this coincidence and similarity in those who profess true religion, it may be remarked that Luther, Jonathan Edwards, Dr. Bellamy, Dr. Dwight, Dr. Chalmers, Bunyan, Dr. Gill, Fuller, and Dr. Baldwin, though belonging to six different denominations, living at periods distant, and at distances great, and under external circumstances much diversified—do nevertheless agree essentially in their views of true religion." It would be pertinent to quote more from this passage; but it would be tedious, and this will suffice. I will now turn over to another. "Dr. John Witherspoon, Jonathan Edwards, Dr. Joseph Bellamy, David Brainard, and Samuel Davis, are gone, as is confidently believed, to reap a long reward in the kingdom of their Father. While they were here, they did not believe that immersion was essential in the ordinance of baptism, or to the forgiveness of sins."

The incident to which I refer is this: In October last, the following query in substance was presented to the Dover Association—"Ought persons immersed upon profession of faith in a Pedo-baptist church, to be received to our communion?" This query was considered as similar to one presented to the Association some twelve or fifteen years ago, which was to this amount: "Shall persons immersed upon profession of faith by any other than a Baptist administrator, be received into a Baptist church?" This, in substance, was the query, as well as I recollect. It was then decided, that such persons might be received, provided that, upon application of the individual for admission, the church were satisfied with his character, and that

he was a believer when he was baptized. Under this view of the query, (I mean the first mentioned,) a motion was made for indefinite postponement. Mr. Clopton appeared disgusted at the motion, and turned to a preacher, who, I learned, was from the part of the country in which Mr. Clopton resides, and remarked, that it was a very milk and water business; and that they (Mr. Clopton and his colleague) ought not to let it pass without making a blow at it. He urged his colleague to oppose the motion; but he declined it. Upon this, Mr. C. himself got up and made a short speech in opposition to the motion, in which he plainly showed that his opinion was, that the Association ought to answer the query, and that it should be answered with an unhesitating NO. A member of the Association sitting not far from Mr. C. made a short answer, in which he endeavored to support the opposite opinion; viz. that such persons might be received. Mr. C. immediately upon the said individual's sitting down, turned to him (it was thought not with the most pleasant look) and said, "then women and children may baptize!"

Now, Sir, it seems to me that there is a glaring inconsistency between Mr. C. as he appeared in the Dover Association, and as he appears in the Star and Index. He, no doubt, believes that the great men who are enumerated in the foregoing quotations, were all authorized preachers, called of God to that office and to those duties, which, I doubt not, he considers inseparably appended to that office. And yet, last fall he classed some of them with women and children! *Query*—Has he changed his opinion?

"Go teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. "He, that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." "Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of your sins." "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, if thou believest thou mayest." "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins," &c. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death."—Does he feel himself authorized to teach sinners, that it is not "essential" whether they are sprinkled, have water poured upon them, or are immersed, when he defines what the action of baptism is; or, that it is not essential whether this is done in infancy, before faith, or after faith? Does he feel authorized to teach that it is not essential whether this ordinance is administered in any of the various "modes" mentioned by a Baptist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, or Methodist man? If our opinion is to be formed from the premises, we should judge he would feel authorized so to teach. He inculcates what is embraced in the last query in writing, and I cannot see why he may not do so when preaching. Possibly he may, by this time, have become reconciled to the administration of baptism by "women and children!" "*Obligare Proteum quis potest Cesar?*"

Really, sir, this case reminds me of an anecdote which I have heard. A man and his wife were found fighting furiously. A third person, who opportunely came up, endeavored to stop the fight, and reconcile the difference. Whereupon they both united and drubbed

him soundly for his interference. You are at liberty to make what you please of this communication, from

AN INQUIRER FOR TRUTH.

---

*Extract of letter a from a Virginia Baptist Preacher.*

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

IT appears Mr. Clopton, by his conduct, has proved to us he is unable to controvert, or prove by reason or revelation, that you have departed from the Apostles' doctrine, and has taken a shorter way agreeably to the examples of his predecessors, the Popes of Rome —got the Appomatttox Association to issue their bull against your writings, and all who believe you are able to prove to every impartial reader that your religious sentiments are more scriptural than those generally called orthodox. He seems to be pleased with the Beaver Anathema, as much so as when Queen Mary had imprisoned Cranmer, and sent to Rome for Cardinal Pool; this pleased his Holiness, and caused that three days public rejoicing should be kept. He with his Appomattox brethren, lays at your door *their* disorderly conduct. Let him point out the individual who is friendly to your writings that is not disposed to live in peace with his brethren. The fact is the whole of the disturbance is on the part of the *priest* and *elders*, as usual. I would ask Mr. Clopton a few questions—Would not the whole Baptist denomination, or at least a majority of them, embrace the ancient order of things, if a few of the leading characters in each association were to do so? This question I have put to some of your opponents, standing high as leaders of the people, and they have candidly acknowledged their belief that they would. This, then, proves who it is that creates the disturbance, and that it is not principles they are contending for, but men and money. Will Mr. Clopton say, that those who have been twenty and thirty years preachers among the Baptists do not understand the Baptist principles as well as he does? or will Mr. Clopton say, whether it is the right of every man to proclaim the gospel in its purity or not? If the friends of the ancient gospel have discovered from your writings that they have heretofore erred, is it not their duty to forsake their errors? If they were not to do so, would they not be hypocrites? Does not the exclusion from the *pulpits* of the Appomattox priesthood of the friends of the ancient gospel, lord it over the consciences of the brethren, and tend to make hypocrites of those "that fear their fear?" Who was it that wished to form the conscience, and control the worship of Abel? Who was it that required the three worthies to worship what *he* worshipped, and *in the way* he worshipped, or be cast into a furnace of fire? Who was it that charged the Saviour of sinners, (when he cast out demons) of being in league with the Devil? And what was it for, if not because he transgressed the tradition of the elders? And for what did they persecute Jesus and his Apostles, if it was not because they would not yield to their traditions and glosses of the word of God? Answer these queries, Mr. Clopton, and the world

will find not one christian among them. But again, what has all the persecution, and martyrdom from the days of the Arian controversy, up to this day come from, if not from the very principles which Mr. Clopton maintains? Whence is Mr. Clopton's authority derived, to exclude from the houses of worship good, orderly, pious men, who see their errors, and the errors of their brethren; and yet are willing to live in peace with them until they shall see as they do, or die in peace with them?

The greater part, if not all, of the bloody persecutions that have ever disgraced human nature, and filled the world with misery, originated with such proscriptive measures as the Appomattox Association has recommended. This they may say is a little thing, but it is an evil, and the consequences that may follow are unknown. Does Mr. Clopton go upon the supposition that the religious *opinions* of erring men ought to be made paramount to the word of God, which we all know allows a difference of opinion? And does it not follow from the conduct of this Association, that their opinions are considered infallible by themselves, and that all must bow to them? I will here give an extract of a canon law of Rome, that your readers may see the kindred sentiments of these "usurping, presumptuous tyrants," who want to shape our religion, and guide our consciences for us to join some sect, or destroy our souls and bodies in hell by refusing us the liberty to worship God. For when a man goes as far as he can in proscribing another for *differing in opinion with him*, we may rest assured if he had the *power* he would go farther, unless they would succumb to him—yes, as far as the spirit of his predecessors have carried them:—

"He that acknowledgeth not himself to be under the Bishop of Rome, and that the Bishop of Rome is ordained by God to have primacy over all the world, is a heretic, and cannot be saved, nor is of the flesh of Christ.

"All the decrees of the Bishop of Rome ought to be kept of every man, as God's word spoken by the mouth of St. Peter; and whosoever do not receive them, they blaspheme the Holy Ghost and shall have no forgiveness.

"The see of Rome hath neither spot nor wrinkle in it, and cannot err.

"Nothing may be done against him that appealeth unto Rome.

"The Bishop of Rome may be judged of none, but God only; for although he neither regard his own salvation, nor any man's else, but draw down with himself innumerable people by heaps into hell; yet may no mortal man in this world reprehend him; forasmuch as he is called God, he may not be judged of men.

"The Bishop of Rome may open and shut heaven upon men.

"The see of Rome receiveth holy men, or else maketh them holy.

"It appertaineth to the Bishop of Rome to judge which oaths ought to be kept, and which not.

"Whosoever teacheth or thinketh of the sacraments, otherwise than the see of Rome doth teach and observe, be excommunicate.

"He is no manslayer that slayeth a man which is excommunicate.

"A penitent person can have no remission of sin but by the supplication of the priest."

The secret in all this matter, is, the priesthood are in danger of losing their craft. Money, money is the golden cord of their bond of fellowship. Look into a late Columbian Star, under the head "*Presbyterian Generosity.*" "The subjoined letter has warmed our hearts with a feeling of universal affection and kindness. We believe that there are many such Presbyterians, and we love them in the Lord. Mr. Smith is *unknown personally to us*, but we would believe that he is not unknown to our Divine Master, nor shall he hereafter be unknown to our affection and prayers." Reader, what makes Mr. Brantly love Mr. Smith so much? Read Smith's letter. He sent Mr. —— *five dollars* for the Missionary Society.

When the avaricious Laban saw the jewels and bracelets on the person of his sister, given by the minister of Abraham, his heart warmed towards him, and like Mr. Brantly, he accosts him, "Come in thou blessed of the Lord, why do you stand at the door?" T.

---

MR. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL,

*Dear Sir*—I HAVE heard it often stated by many of the most respectable members of the Baptist society during the last six or nine months, that they regretted that our old and highly respected brother, Jeremiah Vardeman, had deserted his friend Campbell, and had leagued, or was about leaguing with the Particulars, the enemies of all reform, and against whom he has waged a long, and arduous, and successful struggle of twenty years. Whenever this statement was made in my hearing, or report brought it to my ears, I invariably thought of a remark or declaration I heard brother Vardeman make, perhaps, too, more than once, while he was so successfully exhibiting the ancient gospel to the people during the late revivals in the churches of David's Fork, Bryan's, and Lexington; which was, that he thought if he could live thirty years longer he could blow Particularism out of the country. And really, sir, to witness his labors and success in preaching Jesus Christ, and him crucified, to sinners, on the apostolic plan, during these revivals, both by day and night, regardless of all kinds of weather, did look very much like it. I know very well that brother Vardeman was instrumental in introducing you into this section of country, and then extended to you all his influence; since I have always hoped that perfect cordiality would always remain between you.

You know, sir, that one of the grand features of the reformation you plead, is, for every one to read and judge for himself. I therefore determined to hear brother Vardeman, and judge for myself whether he had deserted the cause of reformation, and was leaning to, or preaching Particularism. I have done so; have heard him several times, and at different places, the last of which was at Bryan's, on last Saturday and Lord's day following, and can safely say, that if his discourse and management of his subject on Saturday be a fair exhibition to judge from, that he has not changed in the smallest degree, but is on the apostolic plan as much and as firmly as any man I ever heard. In truth, his discourse, or explanation of the first thirteen verses of the 3d chapter of the first epistle of Peter, was of the most lucid, interesting, edifying and christian character that I have heard from any man. I have always thought since it commenced, and have no doubt of it yet, that brother Vardeman will stand at the head of the reformation in this state. My reason for so thinking, I am willing for you and your readers to know It is this: Brother Vardeman, I presume, understands the scriptures in their connexion as well, at least, as any teacher among us, and is decidedly better at exhortation than any man I ever heard. But some say you are opposed to such warm animated exhortations as brother Vardeman gives. I have on your part demed this. Am I right? Yours, HADDON.

## THE LIVING AND EFFECTUAL WORD.

A BROTHER in Kentucky for whose judgement we have much respect, and for whose person, on account of his great devotion to the Lord and his cause we have much affection, seems to doubt whether the following words apply to the written or spoken *word of God*, to wit: the gospel inclines rather to apply them to Jesus Christ, or "*the word made flesh.*" The words are, (Heb. iv. 12.) "For the word of God is living and effectual, and more cutting than any two edged sword, piercing even to the parting of both animal life and spirit, and of the joints also, and marrow, and is a discerner of the desires and purposes of the heart."

After a close examination of this passage, as if I had never examined it before, which is my method on all occasions when my attention is called to any portion of the oracles of God, I am again convinced that it relates to the word of God, the gospel, and that it does not apply to the Author of the gospel. I offer but *two* reasons. Not like the Pedobaptist's *fifty-five* reasons for sprinkling, for in most cases the number of reasons is only positive proof that they are not good reasons. One GOOD reason is enough for any practice—for any sentiment. When I see a great display of reasons, it is to me a suspicion that there is good reason to suspect much sophistry, and no reason in the case.

One of my reasons is, that there is a contrast running through this section of the epistle between the word or promise of rest in Canaan, and the promise or word of God concerning a rest in the heavenly inheritance, which makes it necessary to the design of the Apostle that the words quoted should refer to the gospel, and not to him personally who is the Author of the gospel.

If Moses,' and not God's promise to the Jews of a rest in Canaan, had been the subject of the section, then the great prophet, and not the word of God, might appeared in the contrast.

"*The word*" which the Jews heard did not profit them any thing, not being believed to the end; so neither will the word of God which we have heard, profit us unless constantly believed. Diligence to enter into the promised rest, is recommended and enforced by the Apostle from the example of the Jews; and just as far superior as the Christian's Rest is to the Jewish Rest, so far does the word or gospel of Christians excel the gospel of the Jews concerning Canaan. The reason annexed, by way of encouragement to diligence, is the words in consideration. "For the word of God is living and active," &c. This is our encouragement. It will quicken us, and help us to detect every thing in us hazardous to our entrance into the heavenly Canaan.

As there is no creature concealed from the eyes of Him under whose government we live; so from HIS word there is not a passion, nor an affection, nor a propensity in our body or soul which cannot be discriminated and guarded against by the sword of the Spirit This is one reason why we understand the passage to denote the gos-

pel. A second reason is, that the language is that which describes an *instrument*, and not a *personal agent*, and such language as is elsewhere applied to the gospel. The gospel by the same writer is called *the sword of the Spirit;* and surely if the sword of man is a sharp and efficient instrument, the sword of the Spirit is incomparably sharper, and more efficient. Another Apostle says the gospel or word of God is *living* and *immortal.* Peter says the word, which as gospel has been preached, is *the word of God*, living and enduring forever. It is a *fire*, the most active and discriminating agent or instrument in nature; and a hammer which breaketh a rock in pieces. God's word tries the souls of men, as fire tries metals, and it distinguishes between flesh and spirit with more discrimination than any instrument in the Universe. EDITOR.

## DECEIVING AND BEING DECEIVED.

THE Editor of the Pittsburg Christian Herald (a Presbyterian paper,) appears somewhat incensed against me, because I headed the petition on page 215 as above. He seems not to relish the word *deception* as applied to the address made by the Rev. F. Heron and E. P. Swift to the christian public in Old England. I thought the case so plain as not to require a word of comment. But now, as he seems to demur, I will ask him—

1. Is it a *fact* that *more than four fifths* of the inhabitants in this western world, are living without the benefits of a regular ministry—that of *four* millions of souls, less than eight hundred thousand, have *a regular* ministry?

2. Is the Methodist, Baptist, and every other sect in the western country, without a regular ministry?

3. Are there more than a thousand Presbyterian churches in the west; or are there only more than a thousand churches in the western world without a regular ministry?

4. Is it a fact that the resources of this great population are few, and the population so poor as to make a call upon the oppressed taxed subjects of George IV. necessary for money to build a school in the city of Pittsburg?

5. Is the population in Kentucky, Ohio, Tennessee, Indiana, &c. a scattered population? and

6. Are the persons engaged in founding this new theological school "*the friends of the Redeemer*" in this western region?

If the worthy Editor of the Christian Herald, will have the goodness to answer these questions, we will explain to him why we headed the aforesaid petition Deceiving and being Deceived. *Ed. M. H.*

## BARTON W. STONE.

NOTHING but forgetfulness prevented our exception against some remarks made against Barton W. Stone which appeared in the January number of the Christian Baptist in a letter from an Irish correspondent during my absence from home. I intended to have included in my exception to that publication, the epithets attached to the name of the intelligent and virtuous Editor of the Christian Messenger. However, some of the sectaries may oppose and dislike Barton W. Stone, they are all constrained to award to him the good name which a virtuous course of moral conduct for more than a quarter of a century generally secures. My correspondent from Londonderry, perfectly unacquainted with the standing of Mr. Stone, and viewing him through the medium of sectarian prejudices, spoke of him as sectaries are wont to do, not distinguishing between the man and his system. Some of this class, will, no doubt, charge me with Unitarianism, because I have even said this much, which is but a tithe of what I could say in behalf of a persecuted man. Why should we not attempt to render to all their dues? *Ed. M. H.*

## PAST EXPERIENCE,
## *A DANGEROES GROUND OF RELIGIOUS CONFIDENCE.*

*Mr. Editor*—IN —— lived Mr. ——, who was brought under religious exercises of mind, so much so that he offered to join the church in his neighborhood. The church required him to give an account of his christian experience before they would receive him. He did so. It seemed satisfactory, and he was received as a member. He committed it to writing for his future satisfaction. In it he gave the dealings of God to his soul in awakening him to a sense of his lost state, in discovering to him the depth of his depravity, his utter helplessness, and entire dependence upon Christ for his salvation. He had imbibed the peculiar doctrines of the church of which he was a member; one of which was, that a soul once united to Christ by faith might fall into great darkness, and even open, as well as secret transgressions of God's law, without endangering its *eternal salvation*; that, being once in God's favor, we were always in his favor. Whenever he would fall into doubts about his state, or be in heaviness through manifold temptations, he would resort to his *written christian experience*. He did not continue to bring forth fruit—"good fruit"—but, on the contrary, often very bad. But on taking out and reading his written experience, his favorite doctrine had so trained his conscience that it would hush with its accusations and murmurings, and he would go on satisfied. In process of time he was laid on the bed of affliction and brought down to the side of the grave. He despaired of his recovery, and, indeed, it became so doubtful that even his friends began to lose the hope of his restoration to health. In this state conscience once more assumed her authority, and spoke with a voice that awfully alarmed the poor backslider. Here he was, on the brink of eternity, and without the evidence of his acceptance with God. The feelings of his heart, the blackness of darkness that gathered around him, and the awful eternity that he felt himself about to enter, conspired to alarm his wretched soul. In this agony he bethought himself of his *written christian experience*. "Go," said he, "bring my experience and read it to me." One of his family went to the place where he had deposited it, and on examination found that the mischievous rats had eaten or cut it to pieces. On being informed of the catastrophe, he became still more wretched. He had no data—no evidence of his salvation—and he vented his sorrow in the repeated exclamation, "The rats have eaten my christian experience!"

[*The Itinerant.*]

---

## *MONTHLY RECEIPTS for the MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

S C Dunning, Savannah, Geo. paid for himself, David Ligan, J J Helvesten, A Marshall, A G Richards, Mr. Harman, C Dasher, T Clark, J Gardener; J Cuyler, T T Lee, Christian Wisenbacker, Mrs. Wilson, Mary Swigoven, vol. 1. J Burkett, Germantown, Ky. paid for himself, J H Holton, J W Coburn, E Thompson, Susan Frazee, Frazee & Thompson, vol. 1. William Z Thompson, Donerail, Ky. paid vol. 1 for himself, J Giltner, J Neale, and Judge T M Hickey. J Jones, Sen. Casey county, Ky. paid for J Hendrick,

J Huffaur, Col. Christopher, vol. 1; and 1 dollar for J Wilkinson. J W Jeffreys, Jeffreys' Store, Va. paid T W Knight, C Blackwell, J W Taylor, and J Olivan, Mill Grove, volume 1. Nathaniel Burrus, Elkton, Ky. paid for A Shelton, J Cross, Sen. W W Terry, M W Gillum, T M Ewing, volume 1. L J Hemming, Jun. Ky. paid for P Coffman and W Lindsey, J Higby, and Francis Palmer, Fayette, Ky. R Douglass, Pittsburg, paid for S Snodgrass, W James, Mrs. Forrester, G Robinson, and A Wolf, vol. 1. A B Hollman, Louisville, Alabama, paid vol. 1. T S Alderson, Columbia, Ten. paid vol. 1 for J N Brown, G Cathey, W Irwine. W H Goodloe, A Hill, and T Brooks. H Smart, Greenfield, Ohio, paid one dollar. J Clark, Bethel, Ohio, paid for vol. 1. A G Maxey, Pleasant Hill, Ky. paid vol. 1 for himself and H Davidson; also, 1 dollar for J Woolsey. H G Wintersmith, Elizabethtown, Ky. paid vol. 1 for J Hodgen. R M'Clure, Wheeling, Va. paid vol. 1 for J Allen. L Haggard, Thompson's Cross Roads, Va. paid vol. 1 for R Hollins, A Bagley, OTMitchel, J Lacy, and Mary Farrer. J C Ashley, Portsmouth, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for J M'Coy, M M'Coy, A W M'Geagh, J W Veach, and E Musgrove. A Wilkinson, Skaneatles, New York, paid vol. 1 for himself, S Lake, J Terneur, and Eli Goddard. M P Wheat, Columbia, Ky paid vol. 1 for T Botts, N Naylor, W Caldwell, T Massie, jun. and C Hawkins. A Adams, Elkton, Ky. paid vol. 1 for W Chastain, S Mimms, and S T Waggoner; also, one dollar for J and S Mallory, Searcey Post Office, Ten. W E White, White Stone, S. C. paid vol. 1 for J Thompson. M Martin, Salem, Ind. paid vol. 1 for E Denny, J Denny, and J Towbridge. J H Bills, Bolivar, Ten. paid vol. 1 for Col. Thompson. A Ghinn, Leesburg, Ky. paid vol. 1 to J Creath, Jun. for J D Thomas, J A M'Hatton, and J H Murdock. E Sweat, Lebanon, Tennessee, paid vol. 1. J M'Cluskey, Hickory, Pa. paid vol. 1. J Cockens, Canonsburg, Pa. paid vol. 1. James M'Elroy, Hickory, Pa. paid vol. 1. E Murray, Noblestown, Pa. paid vol. 1. J Glenn, Pa. paid vol. 1. G M'Bride, Pa. paid vol. 1. J M'Vay and H Jameson, Claysville, Pa. paid for vol. 1. C Daily and J Philips, Pa. paid for vol. 1. J Moore, Finleysville, Pa. paid vol. 1. R M'Claren, Pittsburg, Pa. paid vol. 1. S W Hunt, Chilesburg, Ky. paid vol. 1 for T Ellis, A Stewart, R Jones, T M Hart, and W Hatch. N Parker, Rushville, Ia. paid vol. 1. J P Williamson paid vol. 1 for J Hicks, T W Bubbard, T Lyman, W Johnson, and G Johnson. Dr. Crockett, Lexington, Ky. paid vol. 1 for H Wallace, F Braham, R Ramsey, A Dunlap, and B Steel. J Hawkins, Connersville, Ia. paid vol. 1 for M Ellis. O W Tucker, Jamestown, Va. paid vol. 1 for D C Edwards, S H Peters, and himself. E Barnum, Matthews Court House, Ta. paid vol. 1 for W Bohannon, Sen. W Bohannon, Jun. A G Cushman, T Talliaffero, and R Crittendon. F W Emmons, Killingworth, Cont. paid. vol. 1 for himself, S Stevens, Deacon I Macumber, G R Parkiss, R C French, and A B Goldsmith. W Bootwright, Richmond, Va. paid vol. 1 for G P Crump, W Dabney, E Anderson, J Wocdson, G Haines, T C Howard, G Greenhow, R Raines, T J Glenn, B Jones, H B Wood, E Redd, G W Atkinson, Mary Kiniard, Ann M Carlton, A Jones, J L Carey, C Talley, M L Jones, R Parrish, D Baker, J B Bragg, M Bosher, J R Ratcliff, Y S Rust, R Chandler, J T Anderson, J P Tyler, G R Myers, R L Staples, Mary Willett, and L N Elliot. P L Towns, Amelia, Va. paid vol. 1 for A B Walthall, J Martin, and N Harrison. R L Coleman, Albemarle, Va. paid for J Alexander, J Mickie, P Cleaveland, J Gass, N Branham, and S Harris. J Blaine, Washington, Pa. paid vol. 1 for himself, H Langley, and Miss D Carter. G Carpenter, New Store, Ky. paid vol. 1 for R Jones, J Ball, B Brown, L Marrett, and W Anderson. J Prewit, Fayette, Mo. paid vol. 1 for G T Martin, G Stapleton, T Sebree, H Vivion, and J A Shirley. E H Gebee, Sandy River Church, Va. paid vol. 1 for J Scofield, Col. J Foster, R Bowman, F T Woolton, and W G Ligon. J. W Fort, Denmark, Ten. paid vol. 1 for R Clanton, J H Fort, and one dollar for himself. R R Price, M'Minsville, Ten. paid 1 for himself and W Price. N H Turner, Jackson, Va. paid vol 1 for J Bagley, R. T White, J Winston, T Johnson, and Nancy Anthony.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 8. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1830. Vol. 1.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## Philalethes on the Scriptures.

[*Continued from page* 299.]

LET us now examine a little the nature, tendency, and effects of the instrument of religious instruction fabricated by men, and employed by its inventors and others, in preference to God's device. It is made up, as already noticed, of creeds, confessions, catechisms, tracts, pamphlets, orations, discourses, speeches, arguments, sermons, lectures, commentaries, expositions, paraphrases, economies, huge bodies of human divinity, and other inventions, and contains, it may be, some portion of divine truth, but so immensely diluted, blended, confounded, and incorporated with various proportions of human conjecture, fable, reverie, and nonsense, as to be unfit for any religious purpose.

1. This instrument of instruction, like its author, (*man*,) is all imperfect. All its elements being uninspired, we have, we can have, no assurance, no certainty that any one of them is exempt from falsehood, misconception, and error; nor, unless, we know ourselves with absolute certainty the meaning of every part of sacred writ, independently of these means of information, can we possibly discriminate between what may be true and what is false or erroneous in them. While, therefore, we seek religious information from these human contrivances, if we reflect at all, we must necessarily be agitated with a doubt and terror; with doubt whether we be not swallowing falsehood and error, as well as truth; with terror, lest we be devouring a mortal poison instead of spiritual nourishment. Our incurable uncertainty, then, concerning the quantity of truth contained in these human instruments of instruction, unfit them entirely for giving us that unquestionable information, which *alone* can banish our fears, tranquilize our hearts, and assure us of the salvation of our souls. For to effect these important objects, the explicit declarations of an infallible God, and not the conjectures, opinions, conceits, and dreams of blundering men, are indispensably necessary.

2. It is unsafe. In the business of our salvation, we can depend with safety on nothing short of pure unmixt truth, proposed to our

minds with unquestionable certainty. But this human instrument, say the very best of it, is but a mixture of truth and falsehood, jumbled together in proportions unascertainable. Can we, then, confidently commit our salvation to such an instrument? Is it not madness to abandon the sure and safe instrument provided for us, and sent to us by our kind and condescending Redeemer, and resort to such a wretched expedient? And is it not absurd to attempt to use them jointly?

3. It is unnecssary. The sufficiency of God's word to save our souls without any alteration produced on it by the tongue or pen of man, is repeatedly declared by the unerring Spirit, and was experimentally evinced long before a single element of the human contrivance, now so much in vogue, had a being. Yes, the souls of multitudes were saved by scripture information alone, before a creed, confession, catechism, tract, sermon, lecture, exposition, commentary, paraphrase, economy, or body of divinity was so much as dreamed of. But could it be granted that these modifications of instruction contained nothing but scriptural truth, they would still be unnecessary, unless it can be proved that divine truth is ameliorated by passing through the mouths and pens of men. If scripture tells us all they tell us, why abandon scripture and resort to them? Shall it be alledged that God's language is not as plain and intelligible as human language?

4. It is inefficient. All the component parts of this *human* device being uninspired and destitute of divine authority, a reader or hearer of them feels no such certainty, reverence, and awe, as seizes his soul when he enters the precincts of Jehovah's sacred residence, (by which I mean sacred writ, for that is now the only temple in which the Deity resides sensibly among men) and reads or hears the oracles of the living God. Nor do they make such deep and durable impressions on his heart. But this is not all: that part of this human contrivance, which is most loudly praised, and particularly depended on; I mean the sermonizing part, is peculiarly impotent. Suppose a person hears or reads a sermon every Lord's day in the year—that every sermon explains or ascertains the meaning of a verse with absolute certainty—that every word of the sermon is henceforth remembered and put to the very best use—then, this supposed disciple, at the end of twenty years assiduous attendance, will know the meaning of 1040 verses of his Bible, and not one more, unless he has employed other methods of becoming acquainted with it than sermon-hearing, or sermon-reading. But if he has employed other methods of becoming acquainted with the rest of his Bible, he certainly is not indebted to the sermonizing project for it—moreover I do seriously believe that there cannot be found at this moment in christendom, a person who is even tolerably well acquainted with the Bible, who has derived his knowledge of it wholly from what is now called preaching; in short, who has not read and studied his Bible in private by himself. Now if this representation of the matter be correct, and of its incorrectnes I have no suspicion, it shows how wretchedly in-

Sufficient that system of instruction is, which has prevailed so long, been applauded so much, and cost the christian community more than our globe would sell for. But this is another very remarkable evidence of its insufficiency; namely, that though so much time, labor, and money have been expended in attempts to render the Bible a plain and intelligible book, its darkness has baffled them all, and it remains as unintelligible as when its expositions first began, at least so say the Clergy; and, therefore, new swarms of expositors are continually summoned to their aid. The true cause, however, of their apparent defeat may be, and no doubt is, that the Bible is of itself as plain and intelligible as it can be made, and its pretended darkness a mere clerical fiction.

5. It is unauthorized. Let him who knows of either precedent or command for seeking religious information from any other source than God's inspired message, just as he has sent it, without addition, diminution, mixture, or alteration of any kind, produce the passage of sacred writ, in which it is to be found. For my part I know nothing of it.

6. It not only produces disunion, strife, contention, and every unchristian feeling and practice; but it renders them perpetual. This is the natural and unavoidable result of seeking religious information from different sources. Different expositors or preachers having in their speeches and writings represented the scriptures as containing not only different, but even contradictory information, and an ignorant and credulous multitude believing their discordant and contradictory statements, not only different, but even opposite opinions were formed; and these clashing opinions of necessity produced different sects, factions, and parties; and these factions, parties, and sects, thus embodied and rendered permanent, gave in their turn perpetuity to the different notions which gave them birth; and to the fierce, verbal, and not unusual bloody, wars, which professed christians have waged with one another for seventeen hundred years. Now it is not easy to conceive how these horrid evils could arise, if every religious enquirer had immediate recourse for his religious information to one and the same source of instruction; that is, to the inspired words of sacred writ; and received them, as he ought to do, in their plain and obvious meaning; for the words presented to the eyes of each, would be the same, and their sense would be the same. But should, through mental weakness, prejudice, or a misleading education, a difference of opinion now and then arise, it would exist only in the breast of the unassociated individual, and necessarily become extinct with its immediate parent. It would neither infect the multitude, nor pass from generation to generation, as different opinions now do, with all their hideous effects.

7. It occasions enormous expense. Here my very soul sickens. I loathe the disgusting object which I am compelled to view. Blessed Jesus! kind Redeemer! can it be true, that all thou hast done, generously and kindly done, to rescue from utter ruin a perishing world, shall bring forth no help to thy glorious cause, provoke no effort to make thy infinite worth known, and thy cause triumphant, till man

mon be aroused and men be made to feel the irresistible power of gold? How long shall the fame of a salary, of a rich living, collect like the stench of a carrion, its vultures in troops from the surrounding mountains? How long shall the making of creeds, confessions, catechisms, tracts, sermons, lectures, expositions, commentaries, orations, arguments, economies, and huge bodies of human divinity, extort from a deluded world its annual millions, and array those who profess to be the humble followers of the humble Redeemer in all the vain foppery and empty splendor of the princes and chiefs of this world? How long shall mammon's touch, which it seems, can make the cause of hell triumphant, be necessary to the preacher's tongue, and the missionaries' feet? How long shall the most sordid and contemptible contrivances be brought into operation to squeeze cents and farthings from the starving poor, for whose relief *alone* God ever commanded a single penny to be raised? Alas! has the religion of Jesus no intrinsic worth, nothing of its own to recommend it, till decked with silver and trimmed off with gold? Was it to the power of that *vile trash*, or to the power of his expiring love, that the agonizing Saviour committed the prosperity of his cause on earth? When, merciful God, shall the day arrive, that shall behold thy worshippers assemble under the influence of pure christian love, for the purpose of acknowledging thy attributes, learning thy will, and edifying one another, and employing for that edification, no other means than thy own inspired oracles, undiluted and unaltered, buying wine and milk without money and without price, refreshing, comforting, and invigorating their weary souls with the richest assurance of divine mercy and favor expressed in thy own words, and regulating others' conduct by the unerring precepts of thy immaculate law!

8. It murders time. The more concentrated information is, provided its expression be clear, the more of it can be acquired in a limited time. How absurd is it then, when in pursuit of religious instruction, to lay aside, even for a moment, the Bible, which far exceeds all human compositions for communicating much information in few words, and repair to dicourses which superabound with words, yet convey but little sense; an incontestible example of which we have in the speeches called sermons. In them it is manifest, that the few words of scripture, called a text, contains all the information which the speech made about it contains, and the reader or hearer knows as much of God's mind when he reads or hears the text, as when he reads or hears the annexed sermon, and perhaps a great deal more. It is, indeed, impossible that any *uninspired* man can tell us more than the fragment of God's word, which constitutes the text, does. If he adds more, he adds of his own, and deserves no credit; and if he spends an hour in repeating over and over in different words, the same information, that is clearly and concisely expressed in the text, truly the exercise, however fine the opportunity may be which it affords to the orator for the display of his inventive power, and pompous language, can yield but little edification to the people, if edification and not amusement brought them together.

PHILALETHES.

THE Writer of the following article first met with the Christian Baptist and Debate with M'Calla, while travelling in this State as a Missionary, in the summer of 1826. Something more than two years since, he wrote me for the first time, ordering a complete set of all my works; promising to read them, and if '*Bishop Semple*' or some other '*mighty man*' should not within two years from that time pull me down, on "the exceptionables in them," which he named, and he remained of the same mind that he then was, he would '*try*' to do it himself. EDITOR.

## JOURNAL OF A TRAVELLER.

### MAINE.

FEB. 24th, 1829. The prospect now is, if I permit it, that the Baptist church and society here will give me an invitation to become their settled Pastor. Thus far, I have preached fully, plainly, and without any reserve, my real sentiments; and hope and trust, I shall ever be enabled to do so. Nothing appears so precious to me as truth —*truth* in sentiment, and *truth* in practice. In the changes in my religious sentiments, mentioned one year ago to day, I have become considerably strengthened: and the more I read and reflect upon the C. B. of A. C. the more I find in it to approve, and the less to blame. On several points of doctrine, however, of no small practical consequence, I am at present unsettled. I wish not so to bind myself, nor be bound, as not to be able to investigate these, impartially and thoroughly; that I may ascertain, and embrace, and practise, and inculcate, the whole truth upon them. If I do not settle here, (as I remarked in my letter to Prof. H.) I think it will be my duty to locate myself somewhere else in N. E.—in a place, where to be a good minister, it will be requisite that I spend much of my time in my study, for three or four years; and then, perhaps, migrate to the West.—But—I don't know. . . . "A man's heart deviseth his way; but the Lord directeth his steps."

My Creed is the Bible alone. It is my wish to unite with all such as agree in this, and who, by being immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have put on Christ, and would further manifest their love to him, by walking in all his commandments and ordinances blamelessly. I would not require any more knowledge, or faith, or orthodoxy, for church membership, now than was required by the Apostles on and after the day of Pentecost—than Philip required of the Samaritans,—of the Ethiopian Eunuch; or, than Peter of Cornelius and his kinsmen and near friends: "For, of a truth I perceive, that God is no respecter of persons; but he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, in every nation, is accepted of him."

* * *

### RHODE-ISLAND.

*March 4th*, 1830.—Evening, Attended meeting in the 2nd Baptist church. After singing and prayer and singing again, the Pastor observed, that "the committee would recommend to the fellowship of

the church after baptism—or rather," said he,—"to come before the church to relate their experience, Mrs. B. Miss F." and some others. These ladies were then called on, one after another, to relate what had been done for their souls. They did so; and told a story from 10 to 15 minutes in length: after which succeeded a catechetical exercise of from 5 to 10 minutes. They then retired, when the Pastor said: "Brethren, you have heard the experience of these persons. We wish now to hear your minds about it. And first, of Mrs. B. Do you feel satisfied that she has received the remission of her sins?" One of the brethren "*motioned* that Mrs. B. be received as a member after baptism.:" and so of the rest. They were received. The Pastor then proceeded to make some remarks—said, "he had been thinking for some time, that they as a church needed some books—that every family should be supplied with "James Church Members Guide"—that within a year he had baptized about 30 persons; and these needed instruction—that though he had never read the work himself, he hesitated not to recommend it as an excellent thing. "The Life of Legh Richmond" too, and the "Memoir of Mrs. Judson," he said were most valuable works; and that it was indispensable that the young converts should be supplied with some of them." After these remarks, he gave out the hymn,

"*Come, Holy Spirit, Heavenly Dove*," *&c.*

Then, after prayer, he introduced another subject—"The Missionary Society." "It is very hard times," said he, "this we all know; but something must be done to maintain our standing in the convention. Let every one contribute *nine pence*, a *quarter of a dollar*, *half a dollar*, or, if able, *a dollar:* but *four pence ha' penny* is better than nothing." The meeting closed with the usual benediction. But now the inquiry was made, "Where shall the candidates be baptized?" The Pastor was for putting it off for a considerable time; but the candidates wished to go forward the beginning of next week. It is now Thursday. This point is to be settled on Saturday evening next.———*How unlike the ancient order of things, all this!*

* * *

While at P. R. S. I met with a young brother, about 19 years of age, who had been immersed a few months previous by a travelling christian minister, and turned loose upon the world. He said, he had not joined any church yet; because he knew not which to join—that he had, for the most part, attended with the Methodists: but thought he should now try some others; and then join where he could *feel* the best. For about two weeks, he said, he had been very much impressed that he must preach; and was then thinking seriously about commencing an excursion—of going into the neighboring towns to hold meetings. I asked him what would be his message—what he would say? He could not tell. I asked him why he believed in Christ—what were the evidences of the scriptures' containing a revelation from Heaven; and what he would say to the infidel, who should question it? He could not tell. Not long after this, I attended a meeting where this young brother was present and made a speech.

His story was, "What the Lord had done for his soul! He *felt*, and he *felt*—he kneeled down beside a little rock, and took hold of a little tree; and he *felt*, and he *felt*." This was the burden of all that he said.———*How like a majority of the "called" and "sent" ministers of our times!* Let every disciple preach and teach according to his ability; and in that way, which he can do the most good.

* * *

NEW YORK.

*May 23d, Lord's day.* Rev. Mr. S. "wondered" that I inquired after the———church—said, "They are Unitarians you know?" "No, I did not know it," I replied; "my acquaintance with them is very small." "Well, they are," said he, "and to know this is enough for me." But yet I inquired further, and went in search of their place of worship. When I returned in the evening, Mr. S. said, "Well, I hope you have got enough of the———." "I did not meet with them, Sir," said I, "being sufficiently satisfied at the door of the church, whither you directed me, I did not go in." ☞Mr. S. whether intentionally, or unintentionally I cannot say, did not direct me to the right place.

Rev. Mr. M. spoke in the highest terms of the genius and learning of A. C. and of his three debates, all of which he possessed; but his other works he did not read. I asked him, "Why not?" He replied: "He *dared not.* Campbell is a man of such talents," said he, "that it is not safe to read him. He is a Sandemanian. He makes water baptism regeneration," &c. &c. And yet, Mr. M. is a Baptist minister in the great city of———and yet he takes, and dares to read the *Columbian Star!* I expressed my conviction that would we know the truth, it was safe to read both sides.

*May 24th.* My visit with Brother H. to day, was very agreeable. The number of members belonging to the church over which he presides, I think he told me, was between 30 and 40. He said they were much calumniated; but had found it better to obey God than man—that they have received the *ancient gospel*, and are endeavoring to walk according to *the order of things* established by the apostles.

* * *

*May* 26th. On my way from Schenectady to Little Falls, I was asked by a Mr. Lane, formerly a Baptist, now a Presbyterian clergyman, "If I, also, were not a clergyman?" To which I answered, *No.* I handed him the last two Nos. of the C. B. He read a little, and then laid them down, saying: "Campbell is doing a world of mischief to the Baptist denomination, and he regretted it very much." I asked him, "How?" He answered: "By creating and fomenting divisions." From a little further conversation, I ascertained that he had never read the writings of A. C. and was altogether ignorant of what he most vehemently opposed. *But this is perfectly in character for a clergyman!*

*May 30th.* I have this evening finished reading "CAMPBELL AND

OWEN'S DEBATE"—expected much from it; and have not been disappointed. It is worthy of being read again, and again. For considerable time now, I have been assured that belief has only to do with *testimony*; that christianity, and salvation rest upon facts. In these sentiments I have become considerably confirmed by reading this debate.

*May 31st.* Arrived at—— P. M. attended the examination of the Senior Class on *Theology.* The following are some of the questions proposed at this time by the Reverend D. D. and answered by his *indoctrinated Pupils.*

Q. Your views of regeneration?

A. Man was originally formed in the image of God—fell. Regeneration is the implantation of a new principle of holiness.

Q. By whom effected?

A. By the Holy Spirit.

Q. How? [No answer given.]

Q. Is it instantaneous?

A. Yes, instantaneous.

Q. What do you understand by repentance?

A. Sorrow for sin, arising from a knowledge of the law, and conviction by it.

Q. What by the christian warfare? Is the heart capable of having two opposite principles at the same time?

A. Yes—I think, it is clear to me, that we may have two perceptions at the same time. See Rom. vii. ch.

Q. What do you understand by the doctrine of election?

A. That God has purposed to save all, who are included in the covenant of redemption.

Q. Give an explanation of faith.

A. There are several kinds of faith—Historical—rational—miraculous—saving, &c. [defines them.] Saving faith means not only a belief of testimony, but a corresponding exercise.

Q. What is meant by the elect?

A. Those given to Christ in the covenant of redemption.

Q. What do you understand by the covenant of redemption?

A. The covenant of redemption is that, entered into between the persons of the sacred Trinity before the world was.

Q. What the parts of each? [*The answer not recorded.*]

Q. Did the Father give the Son a definite, or an indefinite number?

A. A definite number,—the elect.

Q. Did he elect them before they believed, or afterwards?

A. Before. "We are saved not by works of righteousness which we have done; but according to his purpose."

Q. What do you understand by the covenant of grace? Wherein does it differ from the covenant of redemption?

A. I suppose them to be the same.

Q. Why was the atonement of Christ necessary for the salvation of sinners?

A. On account of the demands of the divine law.

Q. In what did the atonement of Christ consist?

A. In sufferings—Think obedience not included.

Q. Did not the Father give him a *commandment* to lay down his life?

A. Yes.

Q. Will the atonement cover all the sins for which it was designed?

A. Yes—[The Doctor here remarks, that he sees no reason for detaching the obedience of Christ from his atonement—thinks sufferings and obedience both enter into the nature of it.]

Q. What was the design of the atonement; and for whom?

A. To open the way of salvation for sinners.

Q. Did God design to save all by the atonement?

A. No—only the elect.

Q. Is the atonement inseparably connected with the pardon of all for whom it was made?

A. I think not.

Q. What are your views of perseverance?

A. If the doctrine of election be true, that of perseverance follows of course.

Q. When was the human soul [of Christ] created?

A. I don't know; but I suppose when all other human souls were created.

Q. When was that?

A. I don't know.——I think however it was at his advent.

Q. What do you understand by the declaration, "Though he was rich, for your sakes he became poor?"

*The Doctor answers:* "It must be understood as referring to his human soul, which he possessed before he came in the flesh."

Many other questions were asked on "*Original sin*," "*Total depravity*," "*Justification*," "*Progressive sanctification*," &c. &c. which I did not record: but the above is a fair specimen of all. The next day (June 1st) at 10 o'clock A. M. heard the annual sermon before the Education Society, by Elder I. P. The following are my notes of this. His text was:

LET THE YOUNG MEN ARISE AND PLAY BEFORE US. 2 Sam. ii. 14.

*Introduction. Remarked on the context.* Twelve young men went out, and took hold of each other by the head, and the consequence was, that they fell by each others swords and died.

The meaning of the word, "*play*." To play the fool is to *act* the fool—to play the harlot is to *act* the harlot—and to play the man is to *act* the man. *To play*, therefore, means *action*.

Having made these remarks we proceed to speak of

1. *The Work* in which we would have our young brethren engaged
2. *The Qualifications.*
3. *The Field of operation*, and
4. *Some of the blessed effects of playing for the Lord.* "Let the young men arise and play before us."

And I. THE WORK in which we would have our young brethren engage—["*play!*"] Preaching the gospel—the triune God, &c. &c. [On this head the preacher was quite brief.] But

II. The QUALIFICATIONS.

1. The person must have grace in his heart—must become experimentally acquainted with the Lord Jesus Christ—must be born again. 2. Must possess a discerning mind. No man can preach the gospel, unless he understand the gospel. 3. A tongue to utter; that is, a gift of communication. 4. That the man should be exemplary, sober, grave, &c. apt to teach. The dish must be clean. 5. The glory of God uppermost. 6. A *peculiar feeling* for the upbuilding of Zion. 7. He must feel for the state of poor sinners in a *peculiar manner*. 8. Possess the heart of a soldeir, that he may endure hardness—must have his face set as a flint. In fine, 9th, he must be called of God, 1st by his Spirit—2d by his church. All who are called by the former, will be also by the latter. When we see a person thus qualified, we can say; "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet," &c.

III. THE FIELD OF OPERATION.

The field is the world ☞The finger of divine revelation points him *what* to preach; and☞the finger of divine providence *where*——some in the city ——some in villages——others in the woods. Missionaries at home and abroad. STORIES. Br. Stammard, Br. Wade, Kincaid, and others. [*Many of the congregation wept here; and traveller among the rest.*]

IV. SOME OF THE BLESSED EFFECTS OF PLAYING FOR THE LORD.

1. To overthrow errors. This was the effect of the apostles' preaching. 2.

The church is built up—the sheep and lambs are fed. 3. For the young men to arise and play in this way, what a comfort it is to their aged ministers! 4. Sinners are converted, and the man of sin destroyed.

A FEW REFLECTIONS AND WE CLOSE.

1. We are led to contemplate the state all are in by nature. 2. The provisions of the gospel. 3. The importance of ministers' being properly qualified. *Therefore*, we should help them. The fears of our old brethren lest our bounties should be abused—we should have godly jealousy. The effects of learning and of ignorance—His own experience—ADDRESS TO THE YOUNG MEN —Amen.

P. M. At 3 o'clock attended the meeting of the Alumni and Friends. It being six years to day, since I took my leave of this Institution; as my last gift, I presented to its library the books purchased in New York; viz. one New Testament, (Campbell's Translation) Campbell and Owen's Debate, C. B. vol. vii. Nos. 11 and 12, and a copy of the debate between Campbell and M'Calla.

*June 2d.* Annual commencement of the seminary.

* * *

*June 5th.* Visited the infant school at W. superintended by Miss M. Too much of the Episcopal religion here—too much praying of the children without understanding it—some very bad habits also acquired of toning it.

* * *

*June 8th.* Took passage in the Washington Line to Rochester. Had some conversation on the way with a young man recently from Yorkshire, England. He tells me, that the Wesleyan Methodists there, (to which he belonged) do not baptize at all. Children, generally, are sprinkled in infancy; but if not then, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, or conversion, is considered all that is necessary.

* * *

*June 10th.* Informed of a "vacant church" in P. where they are able and willing to give four or five hundred dollars to a good Baptist preacher who would please them.

*June 12th.* Between 2 and 3 o'clock P. M. arrived at B. Dined with an old acquaintance, Reverend H. D. Attended covenant meeting with him; covenant and articles both read.

The Baptist meeting house in this place, is a large, well finished, brick building; will seat from 600 to 800 persons. The lower story is occupied for an academy and conference room—cost between $5000 and $6000. They are now in debt for it about $1,500, which Mr. D. thinks of raising from abroad. The church is now building him a house also, which will cost $700 or $800. Had much conversation with him about the Western Country—and, among other places, mentioned Ashtabula. *Campbellism*, he said, had spoiled the people there. "Ah!" said I, "and what is Campbellism?" "Art thou only a stranger in these parts, and knowest not the desolations which Alexander Campbell is effecting? You will find enough of it where you are going." I wondered what it could be; and repeated my interrogation,

"CAMPBELLISM,"

said he, "denies the agency of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men, attributing all to *the word*—makes regeneration to consist wholly in water baptism—makes faith, merely an assent of the understanding without affecting the heart—and, finally, it takes away the office work of ministers; giving to all disciples in the church, the privilege of preaching, expounding the scriptures, and administering its ordinances, without being ordained."

"This is Campbellism!" "Yes." "Strange, indeed!!"——Mr. D. then proceeded to tell me of a Brother Scranton, living not far from him, who was a Campbellite, whom he and some others had drawn out, as *Put* did the wolf, and exposed, and disfellowshipped.—— "Have you no Campbellites at the East?" No, I replied: but I have heard the sound thereof. Brother Collins, too, formerly a student at Hamilton, he said, had become a Campbellite.—And now recollect, that Brother B. told me of a Brother Reynolds in Vermont, who, for becoming a Campbellite, had been treated in like manner. Brother K. informed me of a little church not far from him, in this state; which, for the same heresy, had been cast out of the Association. Alas! alas! "Campbellism" is truly a dreadful *ism*, and "Campbellite" is a dreadful *ite!* They are as bad as *anti-mason*, and *anti-masonry*; and whosoever embraces them must be *Morganized* in his soul, if not in his body!—Slept at Brother J—'s.

*Lord's day, June 13th.* At breakfast this morning, made some further inquiries about Brother Scranton—his sentiments, &c. Brother J. tells me, that he *appears* to be very pious; but many fear it is all a pretence, that he may the better insinuate his new notions —says, that he was even quite active in the church conferences, and talked much about the primitive, apostolic order of things, &c. &c. Brother J. also informed me of a Brother Jeffries, who lives a little further East—said, "He, also, has become a Campbellite; and with him, most of the able members of his church. The consequence— he has been obliged to turn farmer; and is now receiving but little, if any thing, from those to whom he preaches. But Elder Jeffries, he believes, is a good man—he comes right out, and lets every one know where he is; and after arguing his side, if the brethren do not agree with him, he is not offended; but treats them kindly, and seems to regard them just the same as before." "Previous to the appearance of Campbell's works," said he, "Brother Jeffries was ever calling in question every new move among the Baptists; and, therefore, his mind was well prepared for receiving Alexander Campbell's notions."

Attended worship at the Baptist meeting house. A. M. addressed the people on the scripture doctrine of *fasting*, having read as the foundation of my remarks, Isaiah lviii, and a part of Matthew vi During the intermission, Mr. D. baptized a lady, who yesterday related her experience before the church. She had indulged a hope that her sins were forgiven her, for about eight years. P. M. Heard Reverend Mr. D. Assisted in the administration of the Lord's

Supper. At 4 o'clock, heard a long bearded man preach from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation,—one hour and a quarter. In the evening addressed a small assembly on searching the Scriptures.

From all that I had heard of Brother Scranton, I could not but feel interested for him. "Don't call that man "*brother*," said Mr. D. "I don't, nor will I; he is a bad man, and not worthy of that name. A while ago, he sent along an appointment to preach in our meeting house; but I told the brethren, that the moment he ascended that desk, I should look upon it as the signal for me to come down."

*June 14th*, 6 o'clock P. M. Have just finished reading "STEARN's on Masonry," 5th edition, pp. 211, 12mo. To adopt the language of "B." in the dialogue with which he concludes, (p. 210) "I must acknowledge, that his candid reasoning has corrected many of my views on this important subject. I shall return home, a very decided, and, I trust, consistent anti-mason. I really wish that people would take more pains to look into this thing, and examine it for themselves. They could not help seeing the impropriety of a half-way course, which will never destroy Masonry." "Add to your faith virtue"—courage. *Courage* to set your face as a flint against all iniquity; wherever, and in whomsoever found—*courage* to pluck out right eyes, and cut off right hands; rather than to connive at, and support the least infraction of the laws of Zion's King—*courage* to maintain a consistent christian character—*courage* to meet the frowns of friends, and the slanders and detractions of the most violent and bitter enemies: for, they that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.

"Yes, we must *fight*, if we would reign,
Increase *our courage* Lord;
To bear the cross, endure the shame,
Supported by thy word."

(*To be continued.*) FRANCIS.

## SUMMARY STATISTICAL REPORT.

*Of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, for June* 1, 1830.

SINCE the last summary view was given, *six new Presbyteries* have been formed, within our bounds; so that the Assembly has now under its care *nineteen* Synods, and *ninety-eight* Presbyteries.

Our Preachers of the Gospel, at present, are in number *seventeen hundred and eleven:* of whom 1491 are Ordained Ministers, and 220 Licentiates. The *increase*, after deducting deaths and removals, since the last has been 98 Ministers and 15 Licentiates.

Our candidates for the Ministry, who are in various stages of their education preparatory to their being licensed to preach, are 228, of whom the actual increase the last year has been 33.

We have *two thousand one hundred and fifty-eight* congregations under the care of our sessions and higher judicatories; or *eighty-eight* more than we had in June 1829.

*Fifteen thousand nine hundred and eighty-five* communicants were received last year, of whom 11,748 were admitted for the first time,

on examination and the profession of their faith; and 4,237 were translated by certificate from one church to another. Our present number of communicants is *one hundred and seventy-three thousand three hundred and twenty-nine*; the last yearly *increase*, above deaths, dismissions, suspensions and removals, having been *ten thousand five hundred and thirteen*. This was a less increase than that of 1829 by 5,995 persons.

The baptisms in our congregations last year were of adults 3,255, and of infants 12,202; giving a total of 15,457; and being 696 less in number than in the preceding year.

Thirty-nine of our ministers are pastors of Congregational churches not under the care of any of our Presbyteries.

*Six hundred and thirty* of our churches are *vacant;* having neither *pastors* nor *stated supplies*, but depending on occasional preachers which may be sent them by their Presbyteries or some missionary society.

Our Presbyteries report $3,504 13 collected for the payment of the expences of the Commissioners to the last General Assembly. Of this sum only $1,869 82 were forwarded to the Treasurer of the Trustees of the Assembly, to be divided between Commissioners who travelled in coming to the Assembly 37,109 miles. The balance of $1,634 31 was either paid to Commissioners by the Presbyteries which chose to support their own Commissioners, without contributing to, or being benefited by, the general fund; or remains yet to be transmitted.

The funds reported by the Presbyteries as having been collected in all our churches which have made returns, are, for Domestic and Foreign Mission, *forty-four thousand nine hundred and fourteen dollars and seventy-three cents*; for Theological Seminaries, *nine thousand six hundred and forty-three dollars and twenty-one cents*; and for charitable education purposes, *one hundred and twenty-six thousand one hundred and thirty dollars and seventy-seven cents*. These contributions give a grand total of $184,292 84; which exceeds the amount returned to the General Assembly of 1829 by $111,224 58.

*American Spectator.*

## THE INEFFICIENCY OF PRESBYTERIANISM.

THIS respectable sect, respectable not so much for its humility, spirituality, and piety; but respectable for its numbers, its wealth, and learning; for its ancient foundations, being only the *second* daughter of the second marriage of the kings of the Earth with Mistress Roma Babylona, now in her third century, is annually publishing to the world, how illy she is adapted to our government, to the salvation of this community, temporally, spiritually or eternally, to the spread and progress of the christian religion; and, indeed, to all the high ends and objects which fill the heart of man.

The above statistical view of the spiritual wealth, and exhibit of her worldly resources show, that, with all her colleges, theological schools, and thousands of good hard dollars, her ministry can prosc-

lyte only six souls and a fraction per head, per annum. Seventeen hundred and eleven preachers, in 365 days, brought to the "sacrament table" 11,748 souls:—the other accessions were by certificates from other churches. With all the prejudices of 173,329 souls in their favor, with all the contributions by prayer and money, amounting to the grand total of $184,292 84 for education, with all the Presbyteries, Synods, and Councils to aid these 1,711 preachers, their moral power is equal to one proselyte *in sixty days*, or six and a fraction per head, for 365 days. On this ratio, and with these aids, christendom alone would require more than thirty millions of preachers, to proselyte to the Presbyterian altars, the infidels and heretics of christendom. It would require an army of 30,000,000 to do it in one year, and a standing army of the same amount to keep them at the altars when proselyted. So tardy is the march of this *Ism*, that, with all its factitious aids, and the combined impetus of colleges, banks, and theological schools, it is outstripped by almost every other *Ism* in the vocabulary of this century.

Though the Baptist army nearly doubles that of the Presbyterian in officers and privates, yet the ratio of conversion, per head, per annum, is not far different from that of this sect. In No. 2d of this work, page 59, the statistics of 1829 are given. The preachers of this sect in 1829 only averaged a conversion of 8 persons per head, per annum. These are momentous facts, and challenge the solemn examination of all the thinking community. Although Presbyterianism differs much in some items from the Baptist economy, yet the radical features of their gospels are the same; and, therefore, it is not wonderful that the average converting or proselyting power of both should be so nearly equal. We question not the sincerity of the converts in either sect. We suppose them to be equally sincere, and all honest in their professions. It is the system, the gospels of the two sects, which are to be praised or blamed for these results. Of this we have many proofs. One of some importance we shall now offer. Many of those now proclaiming the ancient gospel, once proclaimed other gospels; such as the gospel of John Calvin, or John Wesley, or some other gospel. While proclaiming these modern gospels, their success was not greater than that of their brethren, who are still fighting for the traditions of their fathers. But since they began to promulge the Pentecostian Gospel, their success has far transcended any thing before experienced in the whole course of their labors. Some of them immerse more converts in one year than they formerly did in ten, and some in a much greater ratio. I speak not of momentary excitements, called revivals, but of the general success of their labors.

The Presbyterians are very successful in converting infants. Thus we see that while they sprinkled only 3,225 adults, they could sprinkle in one year 12,202 infants. 'Tis as easy to convert *four* infants as one adult. To these, sprinkling is "a sign and seal of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of engrafting into Christ;" if her views of baptism be correct, and if this sprinkling be immersion!

I trust before many years, it will be found that 1,711 *laymen* will be more instrumental in bringing sinners into the fold of Christ than these 1,711 ministers of Presbyterianism; and that every pro-claimer of the ancient gospel will be found more than equal to a score of those who apply "the torch of Grecian and Roman literature and mythology to illumine the sacred pages of the apostolic writings."

Among the curious facts in this report, it appears that 630 of these Presbyterian churches are "*vacant*." The house, the pulpit, or the people? Vacant houses we understand, and vacant pulpits we know, but *vacant churches* we do not understand. Is a church without a preacher *vacant!* If so, all the churches with preachers are *tenanted*. And if churches are residences for preachers, I trust no man will presume to call them the temples of the Holy Spirit.

Another curious fact, and we dismiss the report. The converts last year, it is said, exceeded those of the present more than 5000;—while last year there were for education purposes $111,224 58 less contributed than in the ecclesiastic year, ending May last. The increase of contributions, it seems, has this time accompanied a decrease of conversions. What is the meaning of this—one hundred thousand dollars more money, and 5000 souls less converted!!! Was it the care of so much more money that prevented the care for souls? or is there something incompatible with the increase of church funds, and the increase of the power and influence of the religion?

EDITOR.

---

*July 5th*, 1830.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

*Dear Sir*—IN your last you seem to express, that I should go on with my dissertations on your views of christian doctrines. To this I must reply, that, when I commenced the correspondence, I really calculated that I should have been able to advance regularly, and to finish something for each number of the Harbinger. My urgent engagements, however, have occupied my time so incessantly that it has been impossible to do so consistently with good faith. Even now, I have only an hour or two of leisure, and cannot of course enter into any discussion of points which will require much attention. I hope, however, ere long to have more leisure, and to execute my first plan. In the interim there are certain preliminaries which it would be proper for us to settle previous to any detailed arguments; lest we might be found fighting without a foe. I am often told by your favorers, that much injustice is done you, and that many principles ascribed to you are far from being your real views. In order to obviate the possibility of any misunderstanding as to your views, I will propose to you certain queries which I hope you will answer in the spirit of candor, and in such style as that there can be no misapprehension.

First: What is your view of the natural *state of man?* Do you believe him to be, according to your interpretation of the scriptures, in a state of total depravity?

Secondly: Do you consider *faith* as the simple act of the mind acknowledging the mere facts of the gospel, irrespective of any divine agency exerted upon the faculties previously?

Thirdly: In your new translation, you have substituted the term *reformation* instead of *repentance* as it is in the old. Please to define reformation according to your views.

Fourthly: I understand you to assert that *immersion* or *baptism* is the act of regeneration, and the medium of forgiveness of sins; and that the scripture does not authorize us to assent or believe that any are regenerated or forgiven until immersed. In other words, that the blood of Christ is never applied, but through the medium of baptism. Is this a correct statement of your view upon this point?

Fifthly: You speak of the Holy Spirit after baptism. Do you mean by the Holy Spirit what is commonly called the Holy Ghost? or do you mean a holy temper of mind effected by the mere words by obedience to its requirements?

Sixthly: In some of your last numbers, you speak of the *Trinity* in a way which has excited some suspicion of a leaning towards *Unitarianism*. Is there any ground for such suspicion? For truth's sake, for your own sake, be explicit upon this head.

Seventhly: What are your views of the *future punishment of wicked men?* Is it eternally, and without end?

There are some other points of minor importance on which we are widely at variance. To these we may finally attend. If the above can be investigated in a proper spirit, I shall hope for good results.

There are some other matters on which I would make a few remarks in the spirit of friendship.

You are not unfrequently imposed upon by persons at a distance, stating, or rather mistating, facts, designed to cast reflections upon the principles which we, old fashioned Baptists, hold sacred.

Some years ago you published a story of an oyster-man with a view to disparage the doctrine of a divine call to the ministry. Of late you entertained your readers with another tale about chickens, and rehearsing experiences. To me you say something of an opinion of mine as to a certain church which had not sober men enough in it to turn out the drunkards. These tales, I suspect, all came from the same quarter. As to my opinion of the disorderly church, I have no recollection of making such an observation, and so I said 10 or 12 years ago, when the report first started. But admit its truth, does it prove any thing? It seems to me to be as impolitic as it is uncharitable for any set or sect of people to reproach another for being disorderly members. What denomination is without them? Not the apostolic church. Not the Saviour's immediate disciples. Who, then, in modern times, can cast the first stone. The story of the oyster-man, the chickens, &c. I should hope had crept into your pages without your notice. I am sorry to see such things. I should not, however, have glanced at these *little* matters if another kind of assertion had not come out lately.

In a letter to you, signed T. M. H. a father expresses high pleasure at your baptizing his son. Now, if this father really believed his son to be well prepared for baptism, it is not strange that he should greatly rejoice at the occurrence. Indeed, I should feel bound to rejoice with him. I know nothing better calculated to gladden a pious father's heart. But, my dear sir, it seems to be exceedingly strange that this pious father would not rejoice at his own success without drawing into public notice the misfortunes, or afflictions, or, if he please, the faults of his neighboring fellow laborers whose sons have not been baptized, not having obtained (as they suppose) the grace of God. Several of us have grown children unbaptized; because unconverted. Many of these sons and daughters live so much like christians as often to make baptized persons ashamed of their defects; yet we cannot consent to baptize them until they tell us "*who hath warned them to flee from the wrath to come.*" This glorying of your correspondent over others seems to me to be quite premature. I would remind him of Ahab's answer to Benhadad: "*Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off.*" This vaunting would be more tolerable, if, in the plenitude of his joys, he had not represented his brethren in the lower counties as less favored than is the fact. Speaking of his son he says, "He is (except two) the only son I know of a Baptist preacher now living in the lower counties that has bowed his neck to the government of Messiah." Now, from the language here used, it would appear to a strange reader that it is quite an uncommon thing for the sons of Baptist preachers to become religious, or to be baptized. Now this is not the fact. Within the bounds of the Dover Association, there have lived preachers that have sons now living who profess, and I hope, enjoy the religion of their fathers. Their fathers, not being now alive, does not weaken the force of the example of these preachers living in the very neighborhood of your correspondent, and adjacent counties. I could furnish a list of ten or twelve sons who are wearing well in their profession; and in the whole association not less than eighteen or twenty: of these several are useful preachers.

I would remind your correspondents, and your readers, that none of us, on either side of the question, hold the principle that the grace of God is hereditary. Many good men know the bitterness of bad sons, and it is certainly not very noble to rake up the ashes of the dead, and to reproach their memory with the folly of their sons and grandsons. Yours respectfully,

Ro. B. SEMPLE.

---

Brother Semple,

*Dear Sir*—THE questions you ask me furnish another proof how deeply imbued are the best minds with the speculative spirit of the schools of theology. No American coin, gold, silver, or brass, more prominently wears the impress of the mould, or more unequivocally designates the mint in which it has been cast, than do the religious minds of this age prove themselves to be the workmanship of system

builders, and the creatures of that philosophy, which however modified by opposing systems, fully proves its descent from Plato, Ammonias Saccas, and the Oriental teachers. Even the best men, who seemingly venerate the scriptures as the only instrument of instruction in christianity, appear not aware how much they are influenced by these speculations. Having been employed for some years in assorting my own mind, and labelling my own notions—finding so much of Plato, so much of Origen, so much of Ambrose, so much of Calvin, and so much of the modern schools, I can easily detect a notion, and recognize its parentage, no matter how often it may have been crossed. We can detect the African blood even to the tenth generation; and to those conversant with the scriptures, the schools, and the history of the church, it is as easy to detect the notions of Origen, Ambrose, Austin, and Pelagius, though mingled with all the inventions and improvements of many generations. You, no doubt, brother Semple, have often seen old errors peeping through a new veil, and though wearing a new garb, *a-la-mode*, were nevertheless discernible as the lineal descendants of antiquated errorists. So I see, or think I see, the philosophy of the schools in some of your interrogatories to me. Think you, Paul would, were he now on earth, propose such questions to me, either to detect my unsoundness in the faith, or to furnish topics for debate?

Why not, then, propose to me some *christian* topic from the christian scriptures? If my soundness, or unsoundness in the faith, be worth an inquiry, why propose to me the questions of the schools?

> ——————"Egypt, Greece, and Rome,
> Drew from the stream below. More favored, we
> Drink when we choose it, at the fountain head.
> To them it flowed much mingled and defiled
> With hurtful error, prejudice, and dreams
> Illusive of philosophy, so call'd,
> But falsely. Sages after sages strove
> In vain to filter off a crystal draught,
> Pure from the lees, which often more enhanced
> The thirst than slacked it, and not seldom bred
> Intoxication and delirium wild." *Cowper.*

Such have I found to be the truth in reference to all such questions. But lest you should think that I wish to evade your questions; or lest any should think that there is in them something more than there is, will give you a candid answer to each of them.

*Query* 1. "What is your view of the natural *state of man?* Do you believe him to be, according to your interpretation of the scriptures, in a *state of total depravity?*

*Answer.* Man naturally, or as he now comes into the world, is ignorant of God, consequently alienated from the life of God; and being without God, he is without hope in the world. With regard to his being in a *state of total depravity*, I must observe, that the term *depravity*, any more than the term *morality*, cannot designate a state: for in states there are no degrees. No man, in any state, can be less or more in it than every other person in the same state. No man is more or less married, or single; more or less a son, or father, than

another. As reasonably we might ask; Is a christian in a state of *total morality;* as is a natural man in a state of *total depravity.* Some natural men are wholly corrupt; but these could not be designated as wholly corrupt if this be true of the whole race; for that which is true of the whole race cannot designate a part. The scriptures, observation, and experience, do not teach me that all persons are alike depraved. Have you not, brother Semple, seen as great a difference amongst children and adults as Luke says existed between the Bereans and the Thessalonians in their former state? The one before they believed were more noble than the other. I am taught that all men who hear the gospel, and who do not obey it, are in a state of condemnation; and that this is sufficient to procure for them everlasting destruction. I know of no use in going farther on this subject than the scriptures have gone. They who submit not to the government of Jesus Christ must, if God be true, be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power which will be displayed in giving immortality to the saints. So far it is a practical question.

But the question about *total* depravity is an abstract and speculative question. It is a proper theme of speculative debate. He that affirms that all men are *totally* depraved, makes all men alike depraved, and as depraved as Satan; for Satan is no more than *totally* depraved. If, moreover, every child born be *totally* depraved, there is no possibility of any person becoming worse than another, nor worse at any period of his life than he was when he first saw the Sun. Are you prepared for this? If all infants are totally depraved, how can men become worse and worse, as Paul affirms some do?

*Query* 2. "Do you consider *faith* as the simple act of the mind, acknowledging the mere facts of the gospel, irrespective of any divine agency exerted upon the faculties previously?

*Answer.*—Faith is faith; and neither more nor less than faith, however it may be produced. A house is a house, and a book is a book, whoever the architect or author may be. So faith is neither more nor less than the belief of testimony, whatever that testimony may be. The testimony of God is all that any christian believes, when he has the faith of a christian. If he do not believe all the testimony, he has not all the faith of a christian; and if he believe more than the testimony of God, he has more than the faith of a christian. For example, I believe all the facts recorded by all the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ. He that believes more than I, must have more testimony than I have. My faith is just as long, and as broad, as high, and as deep, as the testimony of God. Its dimensions are the dimensions of my faith. Faith is not hope, nor love, nor joy, nor peace. Faith is not knowledge, nor opinion, nor imagination. When we think correctly of any one principle, or of any one thing, we must distinguish that principle, and thing, from every other principle and thing. The power of believing is one thing, and the truth believed is another. The sense of seeing is one thing, and the thing seen is another. As we use the term *sight,* so we use the

term *faith*. Sight sometimes denotes the eye, and sometimes the thing seen. Moses said, "I will turn and see this *great sight*." So faith is used sometimes for the power of believing, and sometimes for the thing believed. It requires no supernatural agency upon the eye to see any object, if the object be a visible one. It requires no such agency upon the ear to hear any sound, if it be an audible sound. An angel can be seen as easily as a man, if he make himself visible. God can be heard if he speak audibly, without any supernatural agency upon the ear. So we can believe the testimony of God as easily as the testimony of man, if that testimony be presented in a credible manner. I know of no scripture, of no reason which makes a supernatural agency upon the senses of man, upon the faculties of man, upon the eye, the ear, the memory, imagination, or judgment of man, necessary to enable him to see, hear, or believe any thing visible, audible, or credible.

It requires supernatural aid to make a man see what is invisible, to hear what is inaudible, or to believe what is incredible. Infatuation, enthusaism, or the supernatural agency of Satan is necessary to produce faith in incompetent testimony. No man can be converted to Mahometanism, but by the supernatural agency of Satan; because the testimony is incompetent. Whether a man shall believe any thing is always dependent on the testimony, and on his hearing or attending to it. The power of producing faith is in the testimony. The power of producing hearing is in the sound. The power of producing sight is in the object. A man cannot hear an audible sound, nor see a visible object, nor believe a credible testimony, if he do not attend to them. I sometimes hear not the clock stike once in a day, and often do not see the most visible objects; because my mind is absorbed in thought upon other objects. So many do not believe the gospel, although it is perfectly credible, and as much in their power to believe it, as it is in one who has ears, to hear a bell toll, or a trumpet sound at a proper distance, because they have their minds engrossed and preoccupied with other objects. Hence, I conclude from the reason of things, as well as from the testimony of God, that every man is *inexcusable* who believes not that Jesus is the Messiah; and that every one who believes that Mahomet is a true prophet, believes preternaturally, enthusiastically, or without reason.

*Query* 3.—"In your new translation, you have substituted the term *Reformation* instead of *Repentance* as it is in the old. Please define reformation according to your views."

*Answer*.—The best translators prefer *reformation* to *repentance;* because the Greek language, as you well know, has a different term for each. We only substitute reformation for repentance where the Greek term *metanoia*, or its correlates are found. It is not optional with us. Repentance is not reformation, nor is reformation repentance. I prefer the term reformation to repentance; because it is the proper translation; and, because it does not mislead as does the term *repent*. He that repents, and he that reforms are often very

different persons, Judas repented; but Paul reformed. If men are commanded to repent, when they have repented they have obeyed the command; but if they are commanded to reform, when they have repented they have not obeyed the command. The three thousand Pentecostian penitents were commanded to reform, and not to repent: for they had repented before they asked Peter what they ought to do. It is not to be sorry for the past, it is not to be grieved for our transgressions; but it is "to cease to do evil, and to learn to do well;" it is "to wash you, make yourselves clean, and to put away the evil of your doings;" it is to "turn unto the the Lord;" it is "to draw nigh to God," that we are commanded. Reformation, then, is, in our language, the term which fully expresses the original, and the design of the Holy Spirit. It is not a change of mind only, but a change of life; an entire reformation of thoughts, words, and actions which meets the import of the command. Were I to define "*legal repentance*," "evangelical repentance," and "effectual calling," three phrases of sacred import in modern theology; I would define them thus:—legal repentance is sorrow for the past; evangelical repentance is an entire reformation of life, and effectual calling is unreserved submission to the authority of Jesus Christ. In other words, he legally repents who is sorry for the past; he evangelically repents who reforms his life, and he is effectually called who obeys Jesus Christ in every thing. In one sentence, reformation, in my acceptation of it, is, an unreserved surrendering of the understanding, will, and affections to the absolute government of Jesus Christ, the first public act of which is immersion into his name.

*Query* 4.—"I understand you to assert that immersion, or baptism, is the act of regeneration, and the medium of forgiveness of sins: and that the scriptures do not authorize us to assert or believe that any are regenerated or forgiven until immersed. In other words, that the blood of Christ is never applied but through the medium of baptism. Is this a correct statement of your views?"

*Answer.*—It is very nearly a correct statement of my views. But as I have written an essay of 60 pages on this subject since I received your favor before me, I refer you to that essay for a full answer to this query.

*Query* 5.—"You speak of the Holy Spirit after baptism. Do you mean by the Holy Spirit what is commonly called the Holy Spirit; or do you mean a holy temper of mind effected by the mere word, by obedience to its requirements?"

*Answer.*—It is hard to say what is commonly meant by "*the Holy Spirit.*" But I mean, that not merely a holy temper of mind, but that Holy Spirit which dwelt in Jesus, that Spirit of God which animates the body of Christ, that promised Spirit which dwells in the church of the living God. This is that spirit of holiness which is received in consequence of our union with Christ, after we have put on Christ in immersion. As children, after their natural birth, inhale the spirit or air of this world; so the new born babes, or the regenerated, as soon as born of the water, receive the Spirit which pervades the kingdom

into which they are born; and this Spirit is as necessary to their life and comfort, as breath is to the children of this world. "Because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts." Thus, Peter said, you have purified your souls by obeying the truth, through the Spirit, to unfeigned brotherly love. God's Spirit cannot dwell in a guilty heart.

*Query* 6. "In some of your last numbers you speak of the *Trinity* in a way which has excited some suspicion of a leaning towards Unitarianism. Is there any ground for such suspicion? For truth's sake—for your own sake, be explicit on this head."

*Answer.*—I lean not to Unitarianism more than to Trinitarianism. I believe in God, and in his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, and in the Holy Spirit; therefore, I immerse into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and pray for the love of God, the favor of Jesus Christ, and the communion of the Holy Spirit. I am not wont to conceal my sentiments through the fear of man. On this subject I have been so explicit already, that he who cannot understand me, wishes me to be heterodox.

*Query* 7.—"What are your views of the future punishment of wicked men? Is it eternal and without end?"

*Answer.*—Their destruction is an everlasting destruction, and their punishment an endless punishment. If men are not now saved by the gospel, it is impossible that they can escape the condemnation of hell: for after death no means more efficacious can be used to save them from sin than those employed here:—and if uncured by these, they are incurable for ever. *Sic stat sententia.* Thus stands the decree.

Thus I have candidly answered your questions preliminary to the discussion of some particular topic. And now might I not request brother Semple to furnish his scriptural objections and arguments, if any he have, against the Essay on *Forgiveness of Sins* through immersion? I must say that I feel confident of my ability to maintain every proposition in that Essay, against all opposition; and will always think so until the contrary is proved. This will not be called boasting by any man who says he believes in Jesus Christ for reasons which no man can set aside. To sustain each and every one of the twelve propositions assumed in that essay, I stand pledged.

Touching other matters in your letter, I feel not much interest in going into details. It would be presumptuous in me to suppose that in writing so much, and in publishing from so many correspondents, nothing had appeared in any of my pages which had better never have seen the light. That my eagle-eyed and numerous opponents should not have found more sweet morsels of this sort than they have been able to find, is to me quite marvellous; and, perhaps, to be attributed to other causes rather than to my prudence. These matters you call "*tales*," are very trifling matters; and though I have such evidence for the truth of these as would be admitted by any editor in this country, and such as to justify me in believing them; yet, perhaps, they might as well have slept in the grave with many similar matters which have

been sent me. My opponents have endeavored to turn them as much as possible to my disadvantage. I have not retorted upon them, in any one instance, as far as I recollect. If I had, I could have done it much more to their disadvantage than they seemed to be aware. I could produce many ridiculous stories concerning "relating experiences," and the "call to preaching," &c. which could be documented with names of persons and places, putting it in the power of every person who pleased to prove them. But it is not with such weapons we contend. These scraps were but mere indications of the tendencies of things. We fight against the traditions, and customs, and principles, which give birth to such extravagancies. Our premises and our arguments we will defend; but an anecdote may pass for just as much as it is worth. Some persons enter suits for cents, and contend for fractions. Such is not our custom.

While I am convinced, brother Semple, that "the call to the ministry," and "the relating of experience before immersion," are both unscriptural, unreasonable, untenable notions, and of dangerous tendency; I am not, as some would represent me, opposed to christian experience; nor to the necessity of every man's feeling himself constrained by divine authority to serve his fellow-men in whatever capacity he may be qualified to promote the happiness of man. But you understand me so well on these subjects, and have so much candor, that I need not expatiate upon them at this time.

Hoping soon to hear from you on that all-engrossing question concerning the *remission of sins*, I have the pleasure of again subscribing myself, in all christian charity and benevolence,

Yours, under the Great King,

A. CAMPBELL.

## CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE—*No. II.*

WHEN we are capable of noticing the laws of nature, which are the natural laws of God, we discover that he has one way of accomplishing every end and object. In the vegetable kingdom we discover that each plant has its own seed, soil, climate, and season; and that, without these, we cannot have that plant. In the animal kingdom, every animal has its progenitors, food, element, and climate; and only by these means can it be obtained. In his moral dominion the same connexion between means and ends is apparent. His moral laws are as unchangeable as the laws of nature. Angels, as well as men, enjoy the favor of God according to certain laws; and when any of them departed from these laws they fell into condemnation and ruin. Grace is not lawless. It is not an anomaly in the universe. There are the laws of matter, the laws of mind, the laws of morality, and the laws of Grace.

We should not marvel at the phrase, "*the laws of favor.*" The law of the spirit of life is as much a law, as the law of attraction, or the law of works. No man is an object of mercy who is not in distress. Hence favor cannot be shown but upon objects of a certain character.

There are means, or there are channels, through which, and through which *alone*, God's favor can flow into the human heart. He that would live on the bread of life, must *eat it*. He that would be refreshed and cheered by the water of life, must *drink it*. And he that would have the experience, the peace, hope, love, and joy of a christian, *must put himself under the law of Christ*.

The lofty peaks are barren and parched. The rain which falls upon them communicates to them no blessing—because they receive it not. The vallies are covered with verdure and fatness. The dew and the rains which descend on them convey to them the blessing of God—because they receive and retain the heavenly gifts. So God the proud resists; but to the lowly he gives the blessings of his grace.

On the cloud-capt cliffs and lofty summits, though rains may fall and dews descend, they receive them not, but send them to the vallies. Thus, though God's favor should descend upon the sons of pride, they would not receive it, but send it to the humble. Judging eternal life unworthy of them, they seek the distinctions which from pride, avarice, and ambition, flow. They submit themselves not to the righteousness of God.

Hence it is that the humble, and the humble alone, can experience the joys, and the seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord. They experience God's love by submitting to it. This is a reason why some enjoy the favor of God while others do not. The former submit to it—the latter do not. Those who aspire after the honors which come from men, and are not ambitious of the honors which come from God, do never feel the power, nor the joys of that religion which brought its founder from the Palace of the Universe to a stable, and raised him from a cross to a throne. To enjoy the happiness of an Enoch, an Elijah, a Paul, an Elizabeth, or a Mary, we must walk with God, and be blameless observers of all God's commands and ordinances, as were they.

But the golden secret of christian experience is yet to be disclosed. God changes *the state* of men, and by this means effects an entire change of views, feelings, character and enjoyment. This is the great law of grace. We shall illustrate it by a law of nature:—God said to Noah, While the earth remaineth, it shall not be rebaptized: or, in other words, "Seed time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease." Philosophers and astronomers know, and the most common minds may know, that the earth has, by two laws of nature, two motions—an annual motion in an orbit round the Sun, and a diurnal motion on its own axis. To the latter we are indebted for the succession of day and night, and to the former for all the varieties in the seasons of the year. By a change of position toward the Sun, God gives us day; and by another change of position he gives us all the seasons of the year. Compare the face of nature in the summer months with the face of nature in the winter months, and mark the change. Whence all the genial breezes of the spring? Whence all the verdure of forests, fields, and gardens? Whence all the flowers, and blossoms, and fruits of summer?

Whence all the melodies of woods and groves? Whence all the tenants of every shrub and flower, with all the humming, chirping, and singing which fall upon the listening ear? Whence all the ten thousand changes which revive the face of the earth, and fill with joy and gladness every thing that lives? All, all is the result of changing the position or *state* of the earth towards the Sun. *The change is not in the Sun, nor in the earth; but in its position to the Sun.* The rays now fall upon it in a new direction, and it receives them. Before, or in the depth of winter, it received them not: they fell obliquely upon it, or rather glanced off it. But now its position being changed, it receives them directly into its bosom, and it teems with new life.

Such is the change of heart, of life, and character, effected by the favor of God, through the Sun of Righteousness. Our state is changed by a law of favor. Truth draws us to the fountain of truth. It sets our souls in motion. We are brought down into the water. From this we are brought up again. After this burial we rise to a new life: or, in other words, we are born of water, and thus we come into a new state. Pardoned, justified, sanctified, and adopted into the family of God; the favor of God, or the quickening, animating rays of the Sun of Righteousness, shine into our hearts; we feel their heat and power; they impart life and comfort. We can now receive the favor of God. By the contemplation of the glory of God's love shining in the face of Jesus, and reflected upon us by the holy Apostles, we are changed into the same image; and being thus justified by faith, we have peace with God. Until pardoned we cannot enjoy this peace. "But being washed, justified, sanctified, by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God," we are prepared to rejoice always in the Lord with joy unspeakable and full of glory. Receiving the end of our faith, the salvation of our souls, our hearts bound like the roe, and our tongues sing forth the high praises of God.

As spring, and summer, and autumn, are all subsequent to, and dependent upon, a change of the position of the earth to the Sun; so all christian experience is dependent upon, and subsequent to, a change of state. This change of state is the effect of the attraction of God's love in the mission of his Son, which brings us to him. Through the water we come to Jesus, who came through water to us. And thus, as when the earth was first born of water, the Sun lifted his rays upon it; so the Sun of Righteousness first beams upon our souls when born into that kingdom into which none can enter unless born again.

EDITOR.

---

*For the Millennial Harbinger.*

## TO HENRY GREW.

*Dear Brother,*

YOUR remarks which appeared in the fifth number of the *Harbinger*, afford, I conceive, a sufficient apology for these lines. You find, or think you find, a deficiency in the position which I assumed relative to faith in Jesus Christ. If in fact the proposition is "very deficient"—if my investigation has issued in an error, I wish to be freed from it as soon as possible. And I would be thankful to brother Grew, or any other person, who would be so kind as to

set this subject in a proper light—if, indeed, I have viewed it in false colors. I do not dogmatize—I have not the vanity to suppose *myself* infallible. Where such a diversity of discordant views prevail on any subject, some must necessarily be wrong. And I am as liable to arrive at a wrong conclusion as another man. Truth, eternal truth, is the gem for which I have labored; and if, indeed, I have found but a gilded counterfeit; I wish to have it detected. I wish to submit it to the severest scrutiny; and if it will not withstand the "refiner's fire," let us call it dross—the mere dross of human opinion. In this investigation, however, but one kind of testimony can be admitted. As I arrived at that conclusion by a careful and thorough examination of the Scriptures, nothing can be taken in disproof of it from any inferior authority. *In matters of religion nothing is good authority which does not bear as old a date as the days of the Apostles.*

All the "Confessions of Faith" which we find in the New Testament, are bare confessions of this one fact, viz.—that JESUS THE NAZARENE WAS THE MESSIAH. Peter, on being asked by Jesus who he was, answered, "Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God." Immediately that benediction was pronounced, "Happy are you, Simon Barjona," &c. (Matt. xvi.) Nathaniel's confession was, "You are the Son of God: you are the King of Israel." (John i.) When the grandee of Candace was asked for a confession of his faith, he replied, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." (Acts viii.)

You concede this one point, viz. that "faith is the conviction of the truth of any position from evidence." The primitive christians must have believed some proposition—and what was it? Let us attend particularly to this subject; for if we can discover what facts were told them, we may easily arrive at a degree of certainty respecting what they believed; or what then constituted "*faith in Jesus Christ.*"

Hear the facts which were related to the three thousand who believed on the day of Pentecost:—"Jesus the Nazarene, a man recommended to you by God, by powerful operations, and wonders, and signs, which God wrought by him in the midst of you, as you yourselves also know; him you have seized, being given up by the declared counsel and predestination of God, and by the hands of sinners have fastened [to the cross] and slain; whom God has raised up, having loosed the pains of death, as it was impossible he should be held under it." (Acts ii.) Simply saying, that this Jesus whom they had crucified was the "Lord Messiah;" to which fact, and to which alone, he calls the Prophets to bear witness.

When Peter came to the house of Cornelius, he began that memorable "Sermon" by informing the Gentiles there assembled that "Jesus Christ was Lord of All;" and concludes by telling them that "this very person God raised up on the third day," &c. Consequently their faith could have been nothing more than a conviction of the truth of these facts.

Paul, at Corinth, being enrapt in spirit, testified to the Jews *that Jesus was the Messiah.* And Crispus, the ruler of the Synagogue, believed in the Lord, with all his house. And many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were immersed.

The epistolary writings of the Apostles give us, in a variety of places, a clue to what in those days constituted faith in Jesus Christ, or "saving faith," if you please. Paul to the Romans, says, "The matter is nigh you, in your mouth and in your heart; that is, the matter of faith which we announce, is nigh you. That if you will confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus, and will believe with your heart that God has raised him from the dead, you shall be saved." (Rom. x.)

The most decisive evidence that can be adduced on this subject, we have from the same inspired pen when addressing the Corinthians. "Now I declare unto you, brethren, the glad tidings which I announced to you, which also you received, and in which you stand; by which also you are SAVED, if you retain these joyful tidings which I delivered to you; unless, indeed, you have believed in vain. For I delivered to you among the first things what also I received first, *that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was*

*buried, and rose again on the third day, according to the Scriptures.*" (1 Cor. xv.) John says, that "every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God." (1st Epis. John iv.) And again, "Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ, has been begotten of God." (*ib.* v.)

It is unnecessary for me to add evidence of this description. The sacred volume is in your hand; it abounds with such expressions wherever the subject of faith is adverted to. And though the mode of expression may vary, still the fact we are required to believe is substantially the same,—it is, and ever must remain, a unit. I acknowledge, brother Grew, I am entirely ignorant of what you mean by "believing the truth of the doctrine of the Lord." I know of no "truth" which the Scriptures require me to believe unconnected with this glorious truth, *that Jesus the Messiah has come in the flesh, died, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures.* You say, "Men may believe the *recorded* facts respecting the birth, death, and ascension of the Messiah, while they do not believe the holy truths these facts were designed to establish." QUERY—*What "holy truths" are there independent of the recorded facts?* The general prevalence of the idea that unbelievers believe is to me the greatest miracle of this age. Logicians say that there are certain propositions, which, from their very self-evidence, it is impossible to demonstrate by abstract reasoning. Of this nature is the proposition that he who believes in Jesus Christ, is a believer. And to attempt to prove it by logical deduction, would be to prove that whatever is, *is.* Yet, strange to say, I know of a number of persons who seriously contend that believing what the Scriptures say of Jesus Christ, is not faith in Jesus Christ. That we can know nothing on this subject from any other source than the Scriptures, is, to me, a proposition very evident. Upon your own concession, faith is the conviction of the truth of any proposition from evidence; *ergo*, faith in Jesus Christ is a conviction of the truth of what is recorded of him by the sacred penmen. If I at all understand the meaning of words, or comprehend the force of reasoning, this must be a correct conclusion. If I am wrong, be so good as to tell us what position "faith in Jesus Christ" is a conviction of the truth of. I fear, brother Grew, that you, as well as myself, have been laboring, and do labor, under the influence of some human system of "Divinity." O that we could but speak a pure language!

Hoping that you and I may be able to shake even the dust of Babylon from the soles of our feet, I subscribe myself,

Yours in hope of a blest immortality,

R. T. BROWN.

*Arcadia, Ind.* July 24, 1830.

## A CONTRAST.

THE following curious contrast was lately sent me from Philadelphia.—ED.

*Extract of a letter from Bishop A. Campbell, to Bishop Semple.*

"But it is only by the constant study of the Oracles, that we can attain to those clear and healthful views of the religion which produced such wonderful effects upon the first converts. Those who depend upon any operation of the Holy Spirit to impart to them what is already written, or to explain it to them, will never, never find such aid! I think the experience of one thousand years last past is enough to support this last saying, if there was not another word to be said upon it. Do you ask, What experience? I answer, The individual experience of all the devout of every name, and every page of the history of all the great and good men of that period. Where is the man now living, and where is the history of the man now dead, to whom God has specially revealed any thing in the Oracles, but by studying them? God's Spirit imparts light *only* to them who read or hear the Oracles."

*Extract from George Fox' Journal, pages 59, 60, and 61.*

"For of all the sects in christendom (so called) that I discoursed withal, I found none that could bear to be told that any should come to Adam's perfection, into that image of God, and righteousness, and holiness, that Adam was

in before he fell; to be so clear, and pure, without sin, as he was. Therefore, how should they be able to bear being told that any should grow up to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, when they cannot bear to hear that any shall come, whilst upon earth, into the same power and spirit that the Prophets and Apostles were in? Though it be a certain truth that none can understand their writings aright without the same spirit by which they were written. Now the Lord God hath opened to me by his invisible power, how that every man was enlightened by the divine light of Christ; and I saw it shine through all: and that they that believed in it came out of condemnation, and came to the light of life, and became the children of it: but they that hated it, and did not believe in it, were condemned by it, though they made a profession of Christ. This I saw in the pure openings of the light, without the help of any man; neither did I then know where to find it in the Scriptures, (though afterwards, searching the Scriptures, I found it.) For I saw in that light and spirit which was before Scripture was given forth, and which led the holy men of God to give them forth, that all must come to that spirit if they would know God or Christ, or the Scriptures aright, which they that gave them forth were led and taught by.

"I saw that the grace of God, which brings salvation, had appeared to all men, and that the manifestation of the Spirit of God was given to every man to profit withal. These things I did not see by the help of man, nor by the letter (though they are written in the letter;) but I saw them in the light of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his immediate spirit and power, as did the holy men of God, by whom the Holy Scriptures were written."

[Is not this sound doctrine in the estimation of the populars?]—*Ed.*

*From the Philadelphia Recorder.*

## MISTAKES DETECTED.

### THOUGHTS ON THE MILLENNIUM.

THERE are two classes of persons who seem not sufficiently attentive to the fact, that we may be upon the very eve of changes in human affairs much greater than have occurred. To every reflecting christian it must appear more than probable that the general triumphs of the gospel are just at hand. Such an idea is getting very strongly hold of many minds, and casting the mere passing things of earth quite into the back ground of their most common views. They are ready to wonder why men are still so eager to buy and sell, and get gain, as though time was eternity itself. They are astonished that so few are inquiring whether there is not approaching, in some sense, a second coming of Christ, for which all may not be prepared. Such, however, are not the impressions of the large majority professing religion, the first of the two classes to which we refer. They, perhaps, often hear observations made by public speakers upon the progress of the gospel among the heathen, and the probability that extraordinary changes are at hand; but are wont to regard such observations rather in the light of rhetorical flourishes, than sober anticipations of the future. Now, whatever may be said in reference either to the question of the literal appearance of our Saviour, and the literal resurrection of the saints at the beginning of the Millennium, or the more common one as to the time of this latter event, every professing christian ought to inquire whether the second coming of Christ, in some sense, is not an event, the nearness and importance of which may have been altogether overlooked in his own mind.

It deserves the special attention of the incredulous in this case, that the coming of Christ is usually an unexpected event to large numbers, in circumstances most favorable for correct views of the subject. Thus it was with the Jews, when he came in the flesh—thus it was when he came to destroy the holy city according to his own express predictions. Besides, it is expressly affirmed of his *coming* generally (and this must include the coming which precedes the Millennium) that it is *like a thief in the night.* We are to expect, then, that a state of things not unlike the existing state of the christian church, will actually precede the coming now in question. We are to believe that very few, even of the church, will be expecting Christ at the proper time, or ready to hail his approach.

We pretend not to inquire what the coming of Christ before the Millennium will be in all respects; but a single passage in the book of Revelation marks it as an event in which all will be deeply concerned. The passage is Rev. xx. 4, 5, 6:—

"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.

"But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.

"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

Many suppose that a personal reign of our Saviour is here intended, as also a literal resurrection of the saints, but we cannot certainly establish or refute such an opinion. Of this, however, we may be certain: there will be an immense difference between the righteous and the wicked. And this difference is to be marked at the beginning of the Millennium. One class are represented as alive, *raised from the dead*, in some sense, while the others are slumbering in the dust. And whether this thousand years come sooner or later, it will be a thousand years of joy to all the saints of God—but a thousand years of wo to all the enemies of Christ. Are the professing followers of Christ ready for his coming? Are they ready to take a bold stand in the ranks of his friends? In the day of his coming it will not be sufficient to be found in the livery of his soldiers, while treason lurks in the heart. Nor can there be even the show of neutrality. Idle spectators will no where be found. The energies of every individual will be enlisted in one of the causes at issue. And it ought to be kept in mind, that some little care may be necessary in selecting the flag under which we are to march. There are many false standards erected, and great numbers will doubtless mistake their colors, and find themselves borne down in the ranks of a triumphant Saviour's foes, while imagining themselves his warmest friends.

When we contemplate the changes that have taken place during the last thirty years, and see those changes progressing with increasing rapidity—when we reflect that such changes often go on in a geometrical ratio, we certainly have reason to expect that thirty years more will bring forward changes incalculably greater than those now advancing. The world, as a scene of missionary operations, may be compared to an immense prairie covered with dry grass. Fires are kindling in various places. They may burn slowly for a time; but should a strong wind arise, the conflagration may in a short time be universal.

In the view of this subject now taken, exact dates or modes of events are not regarded as certain; but only so far probable, as to claim the attention of reflecting persons. There may be great mistakes on both sides of these questions; but they are much safer on one side than the other. Time will correct those of the enthusiastic but devoted followers of Christ, while eternity alone will declare those of his enemies.

C. S. A.

## HINTS

*To the Advocates of a Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things, and the Proclaimers of the Ancient Gospel.*

THE simplicity, plainness, and power of the gospel proclaimed on Pentecost, are daily becoming more and more apparent. The proclamation of that gospel is now every where attended with conversions as sudden, as decisive, as strongly marked as many of those in ancient times. Of this I have not only the testimony of others, but I have seen it myself. My duties to the public, as an editor, prohibit my doing the work of an evangelist; and when I make a tour it is more to disseminate the general principles of reformation, than to proclaim the ancient gospel for the purpose of converting sinners to God. It is one thing to state and prove what the ancient gospel is, and another to make it the instrument of conversion to God. Of this I have made ample experiments. Within the last ten days I have been twice from home; and, on each occasion, proclaimed the old gospel for the purpose of converting men to God. On these two occasions *thirty* persons obeyed the gospel, were immersed for the remission of their sins, and translated into the kingdom of God's own Son. Many of these converts had no more intention of obeying the gospel one hour before, than I now have of becoming a Presbyterian. Nor can it be said that they were ignorant, and unlearned persons, an easy prey to error, enthusiasts, or weak-minded. They were a fair average of the whole community. They were of both sexes, from eighteen to sixty years of age. Amongst them was one lawyer, one physician, and some of them were in full communion in Methodist, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian churches. Some of them had lately been sceptics in all religion, and one of them on the morning of the day of his conversion reviled and spoke evil of the ancient gospel. I left these converts rejoicing in God, in their new relation to him, in the pardon of their sins, and in being the adopted sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty.

Nor could it be said that there was any thing like what is called "a revival" in those vicinities. One of them, where I immersed eighteen persons, was a Presbyterian settlement: every thing as dry as the season of the year, and as cold as December. But this only by the way.

There are many persons who are said to proclaim the ancient gospel, and who think they are proclaiming it, who are only talking about it. The preachers of this gospel (for it is different from all the modern gospels) are becoming quite numerous in several of these United States. But there are some of them who only preach *about* it, and others who *preach* it. They are both useful; the former to convert men from the sects—the latter to convert them to God:—the one to pull down systems—the other to make and build up christians. But he who only converts men from sectarianism is neither so acceptable to God, nor so profitable to men, as he who "turns men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among the sanctified."

Some of the preachers of the gospel preach more than the ancient gospel. They launch out into matters pertaining to the designs of ancient prophecy, which they do not so well understand. They also go into details of christian teaching or doctrine, and the internal affairs of Christ's kingdom. All these may be useful, and on some occasions necessary, but belong not to the proclamation of the gospel, and ought not to be confounded with it.

In presenting the gospel (for there is but *one* gospel which we for the present distress call the ancient) there are only a few topics which rightfully belong to it. These are faith, repentance or reformation, immersion for the remission of sins, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life. These topics appear in one shape in the Extra No. 1; but they are diffusely exhibited there. They are capable of being exhibited in many ways, and presented like a picture in many positions to the eye of the mind. But still these are great topics, and from these every argument to turn men to God may be deduced. Turning men to God is the great object and end of proclaiming the gospel.

When persons are converted to God, they ought forthwith to be separated from the world into societies, called congregations, and the ancient order of things, the ordinances, manners, and customs of the christian kingdom given them. They are best prepared to receive the institutes of the great King when they have just recently vowed allegiance to him. While the metal is warm, cast it into the mould. While the plant is young and tender, give it the proper direction. When the child is young, teach it the manners and customs which will adorn the man So let the new converts always, and in all places, forthwith be put under the government of the great King. Let them meet every Lord's day to praise the Lord, to celebrate his death and resurrection, to invoke his name, to hear his voice, and to converse on the things pertaining to his kingdom and glory. Then will they grow apace—they will grow like the corn, shoot forth as

the vine, and their odor shall be as Lebanon. In this most of the proclaimers of the gospel are deficient. They turn the sheep into the wilderness, forgetting both the foxes and the wolves—and unmindful of the roaring lion. 'Tis better to stay in one place until so many are converted as can take care of one another, and let no more belong to one church than can conveniently meet every Lord's day. The old, crooked, mishapen converts are seldom an advantage to the new converts, especially to such as are converted to God by the old gospel. They are too dry, stiff, formal, ceremonious, and untractable. There are many exceptions it is true; but not enough to make it a safe course always to couple the lambs and kids to these old sheep.

Tell the disciples that so soon as the name of the Lord is named upon them—so soon as they have believingly been immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of their sins, they are all made sons and daughters, kings and priests to God—and doing the will of Jesus, they are to him as dear as his mother, his sister, or his brother. Being a royal priesthood, all children of a King, they have a right to meet in his name to break the loaf of blessing, to drink the cup of blessing, without the *intervention* of a mediator, priest, or prophet, consecrated by human hands.

Tell them bishops were never chosen to baptize, to break the loaf of blessing, nor to consecrate the cup of salvation. The Lord consecrated these, and gave them to his *disciples*, not to *priests*. Tell them that churches existed without, and before, bishops in the ancient times—and that "*disciples* came together on the first day of the week *to break the loaf*." That bishops cannot be chosen without they "*are proved*," and that they cannot be proved until they are tried—and that though bishops and deacons are necessary to *the perfection* of a church, they are not necessary to its *existence*. Let them cultivate brotherly kindness and love, pursue peace with all men, and holiness; and let them abound in thanksgivings and praises to the great King. Thus will they enjoy their religion, and be useful to the world.

Let the proclaimers themselves remember that the Apostles wrote the Epistles to immersed disciples, and to none else. The contents of them belong to disciples, as such. From them, it is true, they can draw arguments to illustrate, prove, and enforce the gospel as did the Apostles from the ancient prophets. But it is not necessary to expound all the Epistles in proclaiming the ancient gospel.

These hints are submitted to the good sense of all those employed and interested in converting men to God.

EDITOR.

## To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.

L——, *Va.*

*Brother Campbell,*

ALTHOUGH I am conscious of my inability for preparing communications for the press, not having been in the practice of it; yet having been a spectator, for some time, of the controversy between

yourself and the religious community, I am, from a sense of duty, induced to express my astonishment to you—and, if you please, to the public—on two accounts.

I am not a little astonished to hear from all quarters that you deny that the Holy Spirit has any influence upon the soul in converting it. Of this sentiment I acknowledge I have found no indications in your writings; nor did I understand any thing of the kind from you during my personal interviews with you last winter, when on a tour through this country. Indeed, I feel confident you cannot believe such a proposition: for certainly you cannot think that the Spirit of God is inferior to the spirit of man. Have not Luther, Calvin, Arminius, and Wesley influenced and inspired their followers with their respective spirits? Are not their followers more ardent in their aspirations to resemble their masters, than to resemble *the Chief among ten thousands*, who was holy, harmless, and undefiled, full of mercy and of good fruits? And do they not breathe forth the spirit of the founders as fully as ever did child resemble parent?

I am also, on another account, astonished that your opponents should deny the sufficiency of the written Oracle of God to make disciples to the Lord, while they contend that you have discipled many, and inspired them with your spirit, by your written word, though they have never seen you. Strange that they should feel your spirit and power to the ends of this country, put forth in your written word, and that God could not make men feel his Spirit and power by his written word! Your opponents, if they saw it, honor your word more than the word of God: for they say it is a more potent instrument! I sometimes think that if the advocates for sects and creeds were to contend for them as zealously as your friends contend for the New Testament, they would be considered as influenced by the Holy Spirit.

Indeed, sir, I have always considered God as speaking to me by his Spirit whenever I read or hear his word; and I think myself influenced by his Spirit in proportion as I am disposed to obey his word. For example: Suppose some known or unknown friend, living in some land or country superior to this, superabounding in all the good things necessary to human comfort; should write to me, stating all the advantages I should gain by going to it, and withal pressing me and entreating me to emigrate to it; I should consider myself influenced by his word just so far as I felt disposed to remove thither; and I should suppose myself speaking quite as intelligibly to my neighbors when I told them that I was moved and drawn on by this friend thence, as if I said I was induced by his writings.

It has been urged that the sacred records are read by many on whom it has no influence, while on others it has great power. This is made a great mystery by many. Some explain the mystery by saying that God has, by some mysterious influence, operated independent of the word, and has given them a revelation of it; while having withholden that influence from others, they cannot understand it, and can feel no power in it. Were the question put to me,

Why all who read the Scriptures do not alike obey them, or are not alike influenced by them, if there be no divine influence separate from the word? I would answer the query by proposing another, viz.—Why has the *Christian Baptist*, or why has the *Millennial Harbinger* such influence on some, and none on others who read them? Will they answer this question by alleging that you are omnipresent, acting or operating upon the mind of your favorites to make them understand and obey your writings and exhortations, intended to induce them to return to the ancient order of things? Or will they answer this question by saying, that a rational, sober, and honest investigation of facts, induces many to return to the ancient order of things? Let them answer this question as they may, they cannot fail to find in their own answer a refutation of their own objection.

As to the difficulty of exercising faith, of which some so often speak, I have, I think, found out the secret. Passing by all the learned nonsense, found in creeds, comments, sermons, &c. which has buried truth in the bottom of a deep well, I will just state that the whole difficulty is found in the want of a disposition to obey. There would be no obscurity attached to the word *faith*, and there would be no difficulty in *believing* were it not for that little word *obey*, which God has inseparably connected with it. Ah! here lies the mystery. Few will say, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may enter into the kingdom." And when they are told about denying themselves and taking their cross, or obeying the gospel, then they exclaim, 'How hard it is to believe! I wish I knew what faith, true faith, means!' The *obedience of faith* is that which makes faith unintelligible to many.

Suppose you should propose to me a certain reward for a certain piece of mechanism, I might believe that it was you that promised it, but I could not believe that I should receive the reward unless the mechanism was performed according to your stipulation. But should I agree to perform the labor required, I should anticipate the reward, and rejoice in hope. And is not this analogous to that saying, "Not every one who says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom; but he that does the will of my Father who is in heaven."

Nothing, my dear sir, has induced me to trouble you with these remarks, but a desire to cast in my mite, while the rich are casting in of their abundance, for accelerating the general reign of our Lord and King. In christian affection, I subscribe myself yours,

ELIHU.

## THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

*From the Christian Messenger.*

THESE reforming Baptists are zealously engaged in a good work. They proclaim union with all who believe the simple facts of revelation, and manifest their faith by their works of holiness and love, without any regard to the opinions they may have formed of truth, when those opinions have no tendency to demoralize society. Should they make their own peculiar views of immersion a term of fellowship, it will be impossible for them to repel, successfully, the imputation of being sectarians, and of having an authoritative creed (though not written) of one article at least, which is formed of their own opinion of

truth; and this short creed would exclude more christians from union than any creed with which I am acquainted. So it appears to us. We entertain no doubt of their pure intentions and honest endeavors to do right, but have candidly expressed our fears lest they may do what may undo all their former labors. They have not yet assumed a name, though their opposers have given them many. The general impression is, that they will exchange the name *Baptist* for *Christian;* yet even this is doubtful. For one of them, in his travels somewhere, found a Christian Church of 100 members, which, as he was informed, was Unitarian in sentiment, and very ignorant and enthusiastic.—The writer remarks, "Were it not for the *abuse* of this holy name, I should be called by no otner; but as it is, I shall, for the present, hold on to my letters of commendation, certificates, &c. which call me a Baptist."—*Mill. Harbinger.*

I received a letter from the worthy brother alluded to in the preceding extract, touching his former communication. I know of no man more catholic than he; and as I received a letter from a brother in Kentucky respecting the allusion to the Christian name, I publish the following extract as explanatory:—*Ed. M. H.*

*To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.*

DEAR BROTHER,

I FIND no fault with you for publishing my letter of the 31st of March ult. though there are some things in it which I would have mended. And first, concerning *the Christians.* "From the information received," I said, "I should judge," &c. A short time after this, I attended a conference meeting among them, of which, on returning to my lodgings, I made the following record:—"The name of JESUS being invoked and praised, I addressed them—called them brethren, and exhorted them to continue in the favor of God. As I set down the leading men said, "*Amen.*" They then sung another hymn; after which their Elder arose and expressed 'his fellowship for the strange brother's remarks.' On dismissing the assembly he came forward and took me by the hand—asked me to remain a little while with the church; and, if consistent, to go home with him and spend the night. The bell having now rung for 9, I declined by giving him also an invitation to call and see me at Deacon F—'s. 'He would be happy to do so,' he said: "But"—(repeated he,) "Deacon F—'s!! You are not the *Baptist minister* there, are you?"—"I am."—"O excuse me, sir,—I thought you were a stranger, just come into town." "No matter,—I am the Baptist minister,—call and see me."

He did not call: consequently our personal acquaintance ended with this meeting. As they sung, and talked, and prayed like christians, I felt towards them and addressed them as such; and for my address, I, too, was regarded by them as a christian, till they were informed I was a Baptist: Then, the Elder's countenance fell—he seemed confused—and to know not what to say.

In reference now to sectarian *names,* I am conscious of having no partiality to that of "Baptist"—I much prefer being called a "Disciple of Christ," or "Christian;" but so long as my brethren whom I first joined, with whom I am at present connected, allow me liberty of conscience—of speaking, and acting, and urging upon all the knowledge of the Lord, and more perfect conformity to his requirements; I will not leave them, or join another sect: and if they forbid me, I will not. I will oppose sectarianism in them and in all others: and wherever, and in whomsoever appears the image of Christ, I hope I may be able to recognize and love it.

In conclusion: To those, who, after reading this letter, may, for the first time, or again read my other above referred to,—please correct the following *errata* of the printer:—On page 202, top line, for "tried." read *tired.* Brother A. did not say, that he had long been *tired* on account of the little effect of his labors; but *tried.* Same page, 20th line from top, after "to read," supply *in.* Dr. W. was not requested to read the whole of the 5th volume of the Christian

Baptist, but only the essays *in* it, on the *Ancient Gospel*. And in the next line, for "town," read *thus*. The erratum "but," page 200, line 26, is noticed by the editor, page 240. F.

*B*——, *July* 31, 1830.

Respecting the well-intended hints of the Editor of the *Christian Messenger*, on what he calls our "peculiar views of immersion," I wish to offer a remark. When he shall have examined our "*Extra*, No. 1." I hope it may satisfy him that there is no immersion instituted by Jesus Christ, save that *for the remission of sins*. This, and this only, is the "*one immersion*." If the plain, literal proclamation of Peter and the Apostles upon this subject, be called a *peculiar* view, we may call every act of obedience to the word of Jesus, a *peculiar* view. Then there is an end to every thing in religion, but *peculiar views*. "To repel, successfully, the imputation of being sectarians," is impossible, if obedience to Jesus Christ be called *sectarianism*. And whenever there is nothing in christianity which is not sectarian, then all the world will be under Jesus Christ. Till then, every one who believes, observes, and does the commands of Jesus, will be one of a sect, opposed by all in whose hearts the Prince of the Power of the Air sways his sceptre. No opinion, creed, or dogma of human invention, shall be with us a term of communion; but *obedience to the commands of Jesus* will always be, unless we should unhappily renounce the Lord Jesus as our Lord, King, and Lawgiver.

I agree with the Christian Messenger, that there will be more christians (calling all christendom christians) excluded by insisting on this command—"Be immersed every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of your sins"—than by any creed in christendom. For there are more, alas! incomparably more *nominal* than *real* christians—more who say, 'Lord, Lord, and yet do not the things which he says,' than there are who obey the will of the Heavenly Father. I have no liking for a church after the similitude of Noah's Ark. In such a church the vermin and ravenous beasts, their noise and clamor, (to say nothing of their filth and uncleanness,) are less to be endured than the tempest which beats upon the outside. I would rather have the storm of persecution outside of the Ark, than to have to do with all the reptiles and unclean beasts which might coalesce for a few days through the inclemency of the weather. The true church of Jesus Christ consists of the washed, justified, and sanctified by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

The Editor of the *Christian Messenger* has, it seems, contended for the *theory* of immersion for the remission of sins, when "well guarded" —guarded, I hope, he means only by *faith in the subject*. To contend for it in *theory*, and give it up in *practice*, is only to treat the authority of the Lord with contempt. Of this I hope he is not guilty.

As to the name *Christian*, I have always, since I knew any thing of christianity, given it the approbation of my heart. It is a name which we can legitimately assume. But unfortunately some have assumed it as a *name* only. Suppose, for example, that these reform-

ing Baptists who contend for the ancient gospel and the ancient order of things, should assume to be called *Christians*, how would they be distinguished from those who call themselves *Christians*, who neither immerse for the remission of sins, show forth the Lord's death weekly, nor keep the institutions, manners, and customs of those called "*Christians first at Antioch?*" If our friends who assume this good name, never had gone into a crusade in favor of opinions, nor had laid so much stress upon them; fighting for years about their *peculiar views* of the Deity, and other abstractions which I need not name; and if they had given to their churches the institutions of christians, we should have rejoiced that the name *Christian* did not now designate a *sect*, instead of the body of Christ. As it is, however, we choose the name *Christian*, with all its abuses, and have not for many years ever called the particular congregation to which we belong by another name than *the Church of Christ*. But if any one shall suppose that the term "*Christian*" denotes a Unitarian, or Trinitarian, in its appropriated sense, we shall choose the *older* name, "*disciple;*" and recommend to all the brotherhood to be called not "*Christians,*" but "*the disciples of Christ.*" *Ed. Harbinger.*

## PROPHECIES—*No. I.*

Mr. Editor,

*Dear Sir*—THE ancient gospel and order of things more frequently call you two thousand years *back*, than the glories of the Millennium invite you *forward* to the dreadful and glorious era which is soon to astonish the world. Yes, it comes, as the Lord said it should come—"*like a thief in the night.*" Your opponents seek to decoy you into their thorny paths, and to prevent your developements of Antichrist—his rise, progress, and overthrow. I know, indeed, that you object to connecting the preaching of the Millennium with the proclamation of the gospel. But did not John proclaim reformation, and announce the reign of God then soon to appear. I know of no incompatibility between speaking occasionally, or writing now and then, upon Millenniary matters, and the work of reformation. Nay; I think I can furnish arguments from the prophecies to enforce the preaching of the ancient gospel. You have, no doubt, noticed that there is a blessing promised to them who read and understand the New Testament prophecies. That blessing, in some degree at least, I have experienced.

You are pledged to give us some information on the prophecies; and, perhaps, you may do this in a way which I am not now expecting. I acknowledge that your writings are tending towards the consuming of the man of sin; but we want something more than an indirect approach to these transporting scenes which the prophetic pages open to our view. I, therefore, hope you will indulge me with a few pages in each number, to fill as I please, with prophetic views: I say, as I please, provided I can instruct or please your numerous and intelligent readers. I do not know that you will accord with me in

the conclusions to which I have come. But I think that, perhaps, you cannot do more justice to your readers than to give them brief and connected views of all interpretations and prospects of the Millennium, which are now before the public. This is pretty much characteristic of your course: for you have always given both sides to your readers. This is decidedly the wise course. Your friends are now able to judge more favorably and more correctly of your pleadings for reform—I say, more favorably; for they see the impotency of your opponents; they see that you have reason and scripture on your side; and that they have neither. I say more correctly too; for comparison and examination of both sides are indispensable to correct results.

I need not tell you that there are only two modes of interpreting the prophecies, and that each gives a different result. I care not how many opinions there may be on the subject of prophecy, there are but two modes of interpreting it. I take that probably which you may not approve. But if you do not, when the public have yours and mine, they will have the whole.

It is in perfect accordance with the genius of all you have written—your Debates, the Christian Baptist, and the Harbinger—to give your readers both sides. I doubt not but you will continue this magnanimous plan on the prophecies. I therefore claim to be heard. I am not sure, as before signified, that you and I differ; but upon the supposition that we do, I urge my plea upon your own concessions. If you like me not, when I have done, review me: but not till I have done. I only wish to wear my mask and to have a few pages in every number; and if I cannot edify and please your readers, I will ask for no indulgence. I shall consider the publication of my first number the signal for me to prepare the whole series: if you will not publish the series, return it to me, and I will put it on file for a more convenient season.

My preparation for such a work you know. I have read much, reflected much, and familiarized myself with all the theories of the Millennium. But I swear not to the words of any master. I think for myself; and if I cannot connect the the Old and New Testament prophecies in a more rational and convincing light than my predecessors have done, I will only add another proof how easily we may be mistaken in ourselves; and I hope I will help you or some one else to a better system of interpretation. These things premised, I proceed.

*Preliminary* 1.—Other events besides that of the thousand years reign of Jesus Christ upon the earth, have been the subject of prophecy. Among these we may rank the Deluge—the Destruction of the Cities of the Plain—the Fortunes of Abraham's Descendants before their Deliverance from Egypt—their Lot in Canaan—their Captivity and Return—Ishmael's Fortunes—the Appearance of John the Baptist—the Birth of the Messiah—his Kingdom—the Destruction of Jerusalem—and the Apostacy. All these events were foretold. Now, from an inspection of these prophecies and their fulfilment, I

deduce my rules of interpretation of those prophecies yet unfulfilled. All these events were *literally* foretold —some of them symbolically portrayed, as well as literally described. The pen and the pencil, the literal description and the historic painting, are combined to irradiate the page of prophecy.

*Preliminary* 2.—As the same Spirit inspired all the Prophets, Jewish and Christian, we may expect a unity in the plan, a sort of *fac simile* in the writing, a uniformity in the style, and a necessary similarity in the mode of interpreting. We are not to devise new rules of interpreting the prophecies yet to be accomplished. It is not a new spirit, nor even a new subject; for Messiah's kingdom covers the whole area of the prophetic map. If, then, the prophecies concerning one part of that kingdom, or one state of it, be now fulfilled, whatever rules of interpretation are necessary to unfold the finished part, the period accomplished; the same rules, judiciously applied, will unfold the prophecies concerning that part of the reign yet unfulfilled.

*Preliminary* 3.—The prophecies have never been well understood until near the times of their accomplishment, and seldom more than the prominent outlines until actually accomplished: but these the wise have always understood before accomplished. Our prospects of understanding them will, therefore, much depend upon the fact of the time of accomplishment being near at hand. This the sequel will demonstrate.

These things premised I will undertake to prove the following propositions:—

I. The Jews will, in their unconverted state, actually and literally return to their own land before Jesus Christ appears to destroy the Man of Sin by the glory or power of his coming.

II. After the Jews shall have been restored to their own land, and shall have resettled it, the nations of the earth shall combine to despoil them of their treasures, and to subjugate them to their sway.

III. At the time of this assemblage of the nations, the Lord Jesus will descend to Mount Olivet, whence he ascended. The Jews will be converted in one day; a literal earthquake will shake the earth from pole to pole; and then will be destroyed the cities of the nations, and all that do wickedly. The Man of Sin shall be judged—the dead saints shall be raised—and the Millennium commence from that day.

IV. Christ shall reign literally upon the earth for one thousand years before his ancients gloriously. "Blessed and holy is he who has part in this first resurrection. On him the second death shall have no power."

Other propositions I have in store; but these only do I now submit, as a sort of outline of what may be expected. To prove one of these I will attempt in my next. But as every thing that is good is doubly good by being short; and if evil is much less so by being brief, I shall, for the present, conclude.

DANIEL.

## PROSCRIPTION AND THE FRANKLIN CREED.

PROSCRIPTION appears the order of the day among the Priests. Their reign seems in jeopardy, and desperate efforts are called for. Churches are to be divided, Associations split, and the *Christian Baptist* must bear the indignation of the Clergy. It is the game of the monarchs of Europe, played on another theatre, and for a smaller prize. The Kings formed a strong alliance for their crowns against the people. This alliance was called a *"holy* alliance." The Clergy contend for the mitre against the Laity. This is a sacred alliance too. —The Kings could not, without some aids, their ministers, grandees, and nobles, form such an alliance; neither could the Clergy form such an alliance without a few of the deacons and leaders among the people. But so it is, the alliance is formed and forming against reform. This is no new nor strange event. What reform did not the Clergy oppose? Some few have always turned out for God and man. The Clergy, like every other class of artisans, have some good men among them. Hence some of them have always appeared for reform. But when did the mass or great body of the Clergy stand up for reform? History is mute on this point.

It is impossible for me to give publicity to all the accounts I receive of the proscriptive and inquisitorial measures remorselessly adopted and unblushingly pursued in the presence of the universe, God, angels, and men, good and bad, by those haughty spirits which cannot brook reform. Some of these measures will, however, become incidents in the history of this struggle for human happiness against the machinations of those who seem to have men's persons in admiration because of advantage, and who appear to keep the minds of men under the shackles of human systems for the sake of their own credit and reputation among men. I say, *seem* to do so. I judge them not. Their fruits assimilate them to such characters as those whom Paul affirms serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own ———. But to say that they are such, becomes not me. I only say, that their conduct exactly harmonizes with those who arraigned, opposed, and condemned the Prince of Martyrs, and all who ever since stood up for his cause. None of the saints, in any age, Patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian, ever pursued the course of the Franklin, Beaver, and Appomattox Associations. The Franklin held a *pro re nata* meeting, unauthorized by her own constitution, for the purpose of controlling the other Associations in Kentucky by her threats and proscriptions. She, or rather Dr. Noel, who pulls the wires, met so long before her own appointed season (like an untimely fig, an omen of decay) and before the meeting of other Associations, as to have time to spread before them our heterodoxy, and to threaten them with dismemberment and excision from the Franklin, if they do not, to gratify the Doctor, anathematize the reforming brethren. The Doctor, as I am informed, drew out *thirty-nine* articles for me. I suppose he thought of inflicting upon me what the Jews so cordially inflicted upon Paul—*forty, save one.* These thirty-nine stripes are, contrary to the Roman, Jewish, and Christian law, inflicted upon me without even *the benefit of clergy.*

In forming for me thirty-nine articles of faith, he has ascribed to me words, sentences, and articles which I never uttered or wrote; and many of the others are, by a perverse ingenuity of quoting, made to speak a language antipodes to any thing I ever taught. He has done me the same injustice as I should do Paul, were I to draw out for him a creed, and put into it words which Paul never used to express his own course—words which he used in another sense, and words which Paul never used at all:—

ARTICLE 1. *"The resurrection is past."*
2. *"Being crafty, I caught you with guile."*
3. *"I robbed other churches."*
4. *"No man shall stop me of this boasting."*
5. *"I have preached the gospel to every creature."*
6. *"I was wishing to be accursed from Christ."*
7. *"Lest I myself should be a cast away."*

In this way exactly has my friend Noel and his deacons formed out of my writings, *thirty-nine articles*. I question much whether ever a sillier thing had the name of a Doctor of Divinity attached to it, since the capital D's were baptized in St. Peter's Church. It is remarkable only for *impotency* and *wrath*. Poor men! if they only knew the bitter cup they are mingling for themselves, and the bitterness of repentance which they must soon or late experience, it might sober them again. But as soon could Stephen have persuaded the Jews to deliberate, who, with their fingers in their ears, rushed upon him with one accord, as I persuade these would-be Rabbims to stop and think, and descend to that state of mind favorable to clear perceptions.

Other proscriptions may be expected. We are prepared for them. Let none of the Reformers resent these spirits with their own weapons. Let them possess their souls in patience, and rejoice in reproaches and persecutions. If they are reproached for *the name of Christ*, they are happy. Christians have long been proscribed; therefore the New Testament is full of consolation for the persecuted. EDITOR.

*Extract of a letter from a Sister in an Eastern City.*

SISTER CAMPBELL,

OUR church is in a very cold state. It appears our usual order of things cannot rouse us from our lethargy. If a prayer meeting be appointed, you will not, perhaps, see a dozen at it. If a few christians go out to spend an evening together, they meet and separate for the night without a hymn or a prayer. And what is still worse, very few of our heads of families attend upon social prayer in their families. To instruct our children and servants, by precept and example, is one of our first duties. What can christian parents say to their own conscience when they see their own offspring, morning and evening, engaged in all the little frivolities of town dissipation, without a single precept or example to turn them from the vain show and fooleries we call fashion; never hearing a prayer, but a formal one on Sunday, from the *sacred desk*, as it is called.

Another saith---"We are very dry in our profession. We sometimes hear a warm sermon from brother ———, but it has no effect upon us. When a few of us talk about meeting for reading the Scriptures, and conversing on the good things of the heavenly country, for singing and prayer; some of our *very* Regular Baptist brethren say, "You are a Campbellite, fond of change and innovation. Cant we do like other Baptist churches around us?" &c. Had we not better omit the form of going to church altogether? What use in hearing a text expounded when we must languish at this dying rate? Let brother O. go sharpen his pen for us *decent* christians."

REMARKS.

From my heart I pity the living who are united to the dead. It is to live in a charnel house. Churches without the life of religion are whited sepulchres. I had rather meet with pious Negroes under a tree, or in a wigwam, than with kings and priests having the name without the power of religion. 'Come out from among them and be separate, and touch not the unclean, and I will receive you, and you shall be my sons and daughters,' saith the Lord Almighty. Why cannot those who fear God meet at one another's houses, and speak one to another, read his Oracles, sing and pray together, and upon the Lord's day too? And why may they not, in such circumstances, unite around the Lord's table? Rather than be enrolled among such formalists, would it not be better for those who fear God, to find one another out, and agree to meet by themselves, and worship God in spirit and in truth? Would the saints in heaven, or the angels of God, or the Lord of glory condemn them for doing this, rather than for having a pew and a pulpit, and the dry forms, without the love of God and the fellowship of the saints? It is better first to try for reform; but when reform

cannot be obtained, it is a sin against Heaven and ourselves to continue among them who care for nothing but the name. "O, my soul! come not thou into their secret! Unto their assembly, my honor, be not thou united!"

I have heard of thousands of heads of families, and have in my peregrinations through the country, met with many in good standing in the churches; that is, they were received on their experience, and supposed to be regenerate before they were born again of the water, who did not habitually worship God in their families. In their dwellings was not heard, unless a preacher came, or some extraordinary meeting, the melody of praise nor the voice of prayer. Indeed, from what I have seen and heard, there are hundreds of churches in which there are not ten persons who take any pains, by daily prayer and religious instruction, to save their children or households. I ascribe it to the system of text preaching, monthly meetings, and their notions of grace, imputed righteousness, &c. To quote to such persons the following words, shocks their orthodoxy: "How do you know, O woman, but you may save your husband, and how do you know, O husband, but you may save your wife?" "In doing this, you will save yourself and them who hear you." They believe not that such sayings are in the New Testament. And if they have read them, they *spiritualize* them as the Quakers do Immersion and the Lord's Supper. When I think of the present order of things, I must apply to it the words of the Lord by Isaiah: "The whole head is sick, the whole heart faint! from head to foot all is wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores." "Save yourselves from this untoward generation."

EDITOR.

## MR. CLOPTON—Nos. III. AND IV.

I HAVE read Mr. Clopton's Nos. iii. and iv. in the Columbian Star. Mr. Brantly says, louder than words, his readers shall not hear my defence through *his* columns. Mr. Clopton would have my writings prohibited, and has done it as far as his *decrees* have authority. Yet he professes to be no *priest!!* A *republican*, too, if I mistake not!! From such may the state be long preserved! He apologizes for Mr. Brantly's only giving his side of the question, in such a way as to admonish him to persevere in shutting me out. "The Star is *designed* to elevate the tone of *vital* religion," says Mr. C. therefore hear *me;* but not A. C. The Star elevates the tone of vital religion among the Baptists by making priests vital to religion, and religion *vital to priests*.

Mr. C. has abscinded his Berlin and Milan decrees so far as to make a reply, or a seeming reply to my Remarks, No. 3. And as a mark of great liberality, he has engrossed in his No. 3. the remarks I made, not in reply to any of his numbers, but to a letter, or an extract of a letter, in the Religious Telegraph in January last. This much in violation of a former promise.

After filling five or six brevier columns of the Star with his elegant allusions to my Christian Baptist, Debates, and New Translation, with a defence of himself as solicitor for the Star, college, &c. &c. without examining a single position I have ever assumed, or offering a single argument in support of any opinion, dogma, or practice in fashion among the Baptists, he waxes so wroth as to disregard even his own character, and to assert downright *falsehoods*. He actually affirms, contrary to fact, and without the possibility of proof, that "I have written letters to myself under feigned signatures, commending in terms of high adulation, my own abilities, writings, and religion." Is this a christian preacher of *truth* and *righteousness!!* A man who can thus *invent* and *publish* a downright falsehood, may worthily oppose reformation, and advocate the present order of things.

A piece further on, he asserts that I "*undoubtedly* wrote" the piece signed "*Querens*" in the Christian Baptist. Nay, he actually affirms that "Querens is, *alias*, A. Campbell." Now, if in questions of fact, implicating moral character, this man regards truth and his own character so little as to publish to the world his own *inventions* without the possibility of proof, and conse-

quently without any ground of certainty in his own mind, what may we expect from him in other matters! This is "the elevated tone of vital piety" which is to be given by Mr. Clopton to the Star!!

*Querens*, so far from being A. Campbell, lives 500 miles distant from Bethany. But as he affirmed, he must know his own evidence, and we know what evidence is necessary to sustain a question of fact Let him now produce it. Had he said he thought so, or supposed so, I might have passed it over as I have done his other opinions, without notice. But my regard to what is dearer than life will not suffer me to let this outrage upon common morality pass unheeded. So ends Mr. Clopton's No 3. All hail orthodoxy! patron of truth, candor, and piety! like charity thou hidest a multitude of sins!

Mr. C's No. 4 is alike without reason, argument, or proof. It proves nothing, save that its author cannot reason on the subject of religion, with any regard to scripture, fact, or even plausibility. He quotes the Baptist Chronicle to disprove the truth of the views I advance; a paper which would not be quoted by a lawyer to prove a question of fact No court in the United States would quote the Baptist Chronicle to prove a fact worth one dollar. Yet the truth of scripture views is to be tested by such evidence! But some man may say it is not the truth of your writings, but their effects on society which Mr. Clopton proves by quoting the Baptist Chronicle and the defunct Baptist Recorder. Let it be granted, and what follows? Mr. Clopton is engaged not in an examination of the truth of the contents of the Christian Baptist, but in proving its effects on society. Is this his plan? Let it be averred, and then it follows:—Is it logical, fair, honest, and according to any law, human or divine, that *exparte* testimony, and exparte testimony only; that the testimony of an enemy, an opponent, shall be admitted as proof against the accused. *The accusers are to sustain one another's testimony!!* For example; Messrs. Clopton, Chambers, Noel, and Clack, have accused A. Campbell of heterodoxy. They severally and together are known to accuse him of heterodoxy, and to allege that his writings have a bad tendency. Well, now, how do they prove it? Mr. Clopton proves his accusation by Mr. Chambers, and Mr. Chambers proves his accusation (the same accusation) by Mr. Clopton. They both call upon Messrs. Noel and Clack, and Messrs. Clack and Noel will in course call upon them. This is in fact, sober fact, incontrovertible fact, the course pursued. The accusers join in the accusation, and prove it in detail in their individual character.

But, if Mr. Clopton is merely laboring to prove the tendency of the Christian Baptist, why open the Bible at all, or the Christian Baptist? I know, indeed, he cannot be justly accused of making much use of the Bible in this controversy; but why open the Christian Baptist? Let him quote John Taylor, U. Chambers, and the Franklin Association; let him tell of S. Benson, and of Clear Creek Church, and say that the Christian Baptist has done all the mischief. Now admit that all this is true, and that it is all fairly ascribed to the Christian Baptist, though this is denied and disproved,* still the Christian

*"As you allow, in your pamphlet, that we are good men, and as we have a personal knowledge of all the facts and circumstances relative to the Clear Creek Church, we take this opportunity of declaring solemnly to the world, that the charges made in your pamphlet against the brethren Creaths, relative to their dividing the Clear Creek Church, are utterly untrue.——

We will now state the cause of our separation from the creed party at Clear Creek. The first reason was their violent, wicked, and unchristian temper manifested towards us, and their open violation of the laws of Christ. Secondly, their sinful neglect of the Lord's Supper; they had not attended to it for eighteen months or two years. Their practice was to meet, quarrel, dispute and wrangle month after month. We do aver that it was the constant advice of the brethren Creaths, to avoid a separation, if possible. We endeavored to live peaceably with our brethren; but we failed.

Baptist *may be* as unexceptionable, and as useful a paper as this century has produced, and that for the following reasons :

1. Even in separating these churches, it was only, *perhaps*, (and recollect the contrary is not proved) cutting off the dry and barren branches; or, to use another figure, it was only amputating putrifying limbs. The lancet which discusses a tumor, the knife which amputates a limb, or the axe which separates a dry and barren branch, is not to be blamed with the corruption, rottenness, and decay which they were the instruments of removing.

2. The good done by the Christian Baptist in a thousand instances in the illumination of many minds—the conversion of many sinners—the reformation of many churches, might again, if other testimony were adduced, be made so apparent (admitting it had done all the mischief which they allege) as in the estimation of all incomparably to overbalance all the evils ascribed to it. This is a logical and an undeniably fair mode of reasoning; nay, it is one of the most common exercises of the human mind in all the undertakings of life; for have not the advantages and disadvantages, the good and evil, of every undertaking to be examined before the mind decides upon any course: and what course has no evil attached to it? If I thought Mr. Clopton deserved more attention, I would grant him all his assumptions, give him his own premises, and prove him a *sophist* before any impartial court under heaven.

But once more upon this No. 4. What mischief did not the preaching of the Prince of Peace do, upon Mr. C's premises! I dare say many Mr. Clop-

---

In the 245th page of your history of ten churches, you state, that two thirds of your life you have been an apostate from the spirit of the gospel. Your last pamphlet proves that you have gone further into this awful apostacy; indeed, you seem to be on the very verge of final apostacy; we hope, that if your church has any regard for you, she will stop your mad career, and prevent your committing suicide on yourself. We shall conclude in your own words: "O how will you face your Master, whom you must soon meet."

JOHN MITCHUM,
DUDLEY MITCHUM,
JOSEPH COLLINS,
LEWIS SULLIVAN,
JOHN McQUIDDY,
All members of Clear Creek Church."

### *Certificate from South Benson Church.*

"In reading a pamphlet lately written by Elder John Taylor, we find a charge exhibited against Jacob Creath, Jun. (if it could be considered a charge,) of his having accepted the office of Bishop in the newly constituted church at South Benson, as the successor of John Brown, resigned. Now, we whose names are hereunto subscribed, being a part of said church, do most solemnly and unhesitatingly say, that the said charge is false; and that the said Creath did, on the day of Elder John Brown's resignation, as well as at all other times, refuse to take charge of our church. And, in the same pamphlet, he charges the Creaths with splitting the said church. This charge is equally false. The members that incline to Particularism effected this split by the use they made of the Beaver items. This statement we voluntarily offer, as an act of justice we owe to the brethren Creaths, whom they have wantonly attempted to injure through old brother Taylor. Given under our hands this 12th day of June, 1830.

*H. Nation,*
*R. C. Casey,*
*S. Bailey,*
*J. Brown,*
*L. Wilson,*
*J. Elliston, Jun.*
*J. Reddish,*
*T. Elliston,*
*J. Scofield,*
*T. Gaines,*
*D. Brown,*

tens, or Caiaphases, in those days, reasoned with Mr. Clopton's logic thus:—"This Jesus pretends to be the Prince of *Peace;* but see what discords mark his progress—how many families has he distracted. In our towns, and synagogues, and in our metropolis, before this Messenger of Peace appeared among us all was peaceful and quiet—all was friendship and love—the ministers of religion were respected, and universal harmony prevailed. But now look at Nazareth, behold Capernaum, and Bethsaida! see even the holy city and the temple! what discords and strifes! Even parents cast out their children, and children their parents; yet he is the Prince of *Peace!!!*" This is Mr. C's logic in his last number, and how just it is you may judge by observing that it would have rejected the Saviour Jesus, and led him to Mount Calvary.

If I had not determined to dismiss Mr. C's No. 4. with what has been said as honoring it more than it deserves, I would allude to his quoting the good old Baptists of Virginia to prove his doctrine. He parades the celebrated Courtney Lunsford, Straughan, the *Apostle* Harras, Waller, Weatherford, and Shelburn, pretty much as the Jews who opposed John and the Saviour, were wont to array Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, and Elijah against the Saviour and his Apostles. Their testimony is relied on by Mr. C. These good old men are gone to be judged for themselves, and they must not judge for us. They were, I dare say, pyramids in vales, and lights in a dark age.

EDITOR.

## AFRICA.

THE missionaries of the Church Missionary Society in Egypt and Abyssinia, have discovered, in the interior of Africa, a tribe, called the Magagine, which has never been visited by any European. They inhabit a place, called Darbia, 300 milles south-west of Darfur. They have suffered greatly from the slave-traders of Darfur; their chief protection against whom is a natural fortification, a steep and lofty mountain which if they can reach in time, they are safe from their pursuers. They do not materially suffer from want in that asylum, having good fountains and pasturage for their cattle. The seige of the mountain lasts sometimes for several months. The abodes of the people are usually pulled down by their enemies; but they do not think much of the trouble of building other houses of mud and stones in place of their former abodes. Nobody claims a property of soil, and every one cultivates as much ground as he pleases. The Magagine are a free people, and appreciate liberty as the greatest blessing. Slavery, therefore, is to them the greatest horror and abomination. Their liberty, however, is not without order and discipline. They have good and just laws, not many, according to which differences are adjusted. They have a headman, whom they obey; trifling quarrels are never referred to the judge, but are settled by the parties in single combat. They have an idea of a God, and believe that every person receives reward or punishment according to his merits, after this life. They have a notion of the existence of the devil. The history of the Deluge is preserved in their traditions; but they believe that every living creature perished in that awful calamity, and that God created altogether new beings after the Deluge. Good angels are considered as the guardians of good people. Their mode of worship appears to be simple, and is free from obscene practices; but they are still

Pagans. They take great care of their children, and teach them early to obey and reverence their parents, and good people. Their language is unknown. We heartily join in the prayer of the missionaries, that it would please God to enlighten this and all the tribes of Africa, with the light of his blessed Gospel, and prosper the labors of his servants among men. *Philadelphia Recorder.*

## UNIVERSALITY OF TAXATION.

TAXES upon every article that enters into the mouth, or covers the back, or is placed under the foot; taxes upon every thing that is pleasant to see, hear, feel, smell, and taste; taxes upon warmth, light, and locomotion; taxes on every thing on earth, and the waters under the earth; on every thing that comes from abroad, or is grown at home; taxes on the raw material; taxes on every value that is added to it by the industry of man; taxes on the sauce which pampers man's appetite, and the drug which restores him to health; on the ermine which decorates the judge, and the rope which hangs the criminal; on the poor man's salt, and the rich man's spice; on the brass nails of the coffin, and the ribbands of the bride; at bed or at board, couchant or levant, we must pay. The schoolboy whips his taxed top; the beardless youth manages his taxed horse with a taxed bridle on a taxed road; and the dying Englishman pouring his medicine, which has paid 7 per cent. into a spoon which has paid 15 per cent. throws himself back upon his chintz bed, which has paid 22 per cent. makes his will on stamped paper, and expires in the arms of an apothecary, who has paid £100 for the privilege of putting him to death. His whole property is then taxed from 2 to 10 per cent. Besides the probate, large fees are demanded for burying him in the chancel; his virtues are handed down to posterity on TAXED marble: and he is then gathered to his fathers—to be TAXED no more.

*Late English paper.*

## MORE HETERODOXY.

THE celebrated Rev. E. Irving has received a severe castigation lately in the PULPIT. In the sketch to which we refer, it is said of Mr. I. "He became dissatisfied with the view taken of the two sacraments; and justly offended at their being received in some quarters as base signs, he has ended with making baptism regeneration, and his view of the other sacrament, as far as we can understand it, appears to approach most closely to that of consubstantiation." These are heavy charges, but we believe they admit of undeniable proof from Mr. I.'s own works. *British Magazine.*

### EFFECT OF EDUCATION UPON THE NEGRO SLAVES IN THE WEST INDIES.

THE Committee of the Wesleyan Missionary Society of England, which has instructed many thousands of slaves in the West Indies, assert that, for forty years, no slave in their societies had been either "a conspirator, a rebel, or insubordinate." Here is a most unanswerable testimony to the influence of religious instruction in promoting the personal security of masters. *Zion's Advocate.*

## MONTHLY RECEIPTS

### *For the Millennial Harbinger.*

T E Becton, Murfreesborough, paid $2. H Green, Deatonville, Va. $2. L Chase, Cleaveland, Ohio, $3. C Trevor, Connellsville, Pa. paid vol 1 for himself and J Newmyer. W Johnston, Fairfield, Pa. vol 1 for himself, W Paxton, W M'Millan, D Blythe, S M'Farlan, and A M'Ginley. S Rogers, Ohio, vol. 1 for himself and W Wilson. S Young, Centreville, Mi. vol 1. S M Curchill, Deerfield, O. vol. 1 for S Colton. J W Letton, Flat Rock, Ky. vol. 1 for himself and C T Chamblin. S Weathington and L Cammack, Maysville, paid vol. 1. Mrs. Ogle, Somerset, Pa. vol. 1. D Warford, Mount Pleasant, Ind. vol. 1 for W Houghton. L Brook, Mount Pleasant, Ind. $2 62½. T Miles, Buckingham Court-House, Va. 40 dollars for subscribers, names not stated. J W'Daniel, Winchester, Ten. vol. 1 for himself, G Lipscomb, G M'Clasky, W Estell, J Wilks, and R Simmons. L Page, Russellville, Ky. vol. 1, M Hogan, W Hogan, F Faqua, B Spencer, W Gordon, G H Brown, J L Page, E Trabue, W Owen, P Edwards, and J Payne. F O Sutton, White Chimneys, Va. vol. 1, A Clayton, R C Sutton, J B Gatewood, G Chapman, T Jones, and J Norment. A Ellis, Georgetown, Ohio, vol. 1, R Allen, and J D White. W D Jourdan, Locust Shade, Ten. vol. 1, Dr. J Owsley, T Baker, S Baker, M Davis, and J Reneau. C M'Neely, Ohio, vol 1. J Hubbell, Newburg, Ohio, 1 dollar. O Newcomb, Wadsworth, Ohio, vol. 1, W Eyles, C Hard, A Green, C Sumner, and J S Sumner. L Haggard, Creelsburg, Ky. vol. 1, G W Hutchens, and P W Dryden. J Morris, Bethel, Ohio, paid vol. 1, T Tingley. W E True, New Castle, Ky. vol. 1 for himself, J H Sanders, R White, J Black, and Tureman & Smith; also, G Ray, 1 dollar. S E Shepherd, Troy, Pa. vol. 1, G Wells and H Wood. J Fassett, Columbus, Ind. vol. 1 for himself, J A Crane, H Dickinson, S Nelson. W Robertson, W S Jones, W P Nelson, P Troutman, E Arnold, J Gale, J H Vanmeter. G W Nuckles, Shelbyville, Ky. vol. 1, W Jarvis, J Whitaker, W Rouse, H Pulin, and W Standeford. J Rogers, Carlisle, Ky. vol. 1, H Dinsmore, Stephenson & Matchett, West and Henry, and G Bryant. W H Purkins, Tappahannock, Va. vol. 1, W S Croxton, J Smith, S C Gordon, T Pilcher, P J Derieux, R S Noel, and M Muse. J Jones, Sen. vol. J H Dunn, and J Warren; also, 1 dollar for J Wilkinson. J Ficklin, Esq. Lexington, Kentucky, paid volume 1 for W Boon, S Bryan, W Bryan, H C Coons, J E Christian, A Gibboney, M Ghist, P Higbie, J Higbie, J Hager, T W Jones, J Lamm, A B Morton, E R Osbourne, W Poindexter, R Patterson, T Rogers, W Sullivan, A W Thompson, President Woods, and J H Wilson; also, J Rogers, Athens, Ky. and P. Hadenburg, Jackson, Ten. T S Alderson, Columbia, Ten. vol. 1, W Hopewood, J W Reccand, A Elston, and J Yonvill. C Martin, Troy, Ohio, volume 1 for J Duessee. G W Trabue, Glasgow, Ky. volume 1, S P Boudery, B G Douglass, B W Terry, W Logan, W E Mumford, P S Kirtley, B M Crenshaw, S T Logan, W S Jones, & W Evans. D L M'Farland, Ind. vol. 1 for himself and J Merrill. J Gaskill, New Lisbon, Ohio, vol. 1, J Long and J Underwood; also 1 dollar each for J Cownover, J Williard, and J Alcut. J H Martin, La Fayette, Ind. 5 dollars for subscribers, names not stated. O Thomas, Roberts' Store, Ky. vol. 1, J H Stone, J Huffman, and P G Fore. D Kellough, Bloomington, Ind. vol. 1, D Batterton. W Flowers, Rome, Ten. vol. 1, B Ninrely, and G M'Allister; also, 1 dollar for J Moore. W T Mills, Summerville, Ten. vol. 1 for himself and J Willfong. M Cole, Charlestown, Ind. vol. 1, A Goodwine, A Willhoyt, W W Goodwin, W Pangburn, & E Baldwin. T Bullock, Versailles, Ky. vol. 1, J Collins. J Mitchum, J W Craig, B Craig, W Woolfolk, P T Fisher, Thomas Woolfolk, T Hewit, and himself; also, C Gibson, Port Gibson, Mi. J Cable, Steubenville, Ohio, vol. 1, D Cable, Jacob Cable, W. Hunter, J White, D Wilkin, and B Jewett, J Smith, Economy, Ind. 1 dollar for himself. J Philips, Steubenville, Ohio, vol. 1 for Jacob Vail. G W Elley, Nicholasville, Ky. volume 1, J Gray, J Atwood, of Phila-

delphia, G Falconer, W Shrive, P H Higbie, and L Singleton, Nicholasville. J Lusk, vol. 1. George Brown, Mr. Duncan, W Logan, and J Sale. A Shallenberger, Mount Pleasant, Pa. vol. 1, L Zimmerman, H Neal, A Stouffer, J Robinson, and himself; also, $1 12½ for J Slenecker. S G Earle, Earle's Store, S. C. vol. 1, J M'Farland, E M'Farland, and J. Harrison. W Hayden, Austintown, Ohio. paid volume 1 for J Calvin, Palmyra; S Russell, Aurora; J Henry, Austintown; S Hayden, Youngstown: and two dollars for himself. James Coit, Shalersville. Elihu Bates, Hartford. T Fenton, and E Scofield, Bricksville. F V Sutton, Caroline, Va. vol. 1, F Burke, R Norment, and S D Peatross. J N Smith, Athens, Alabama, volume 1, William Miller, and James Johnston. A H F Payne, Washington, Kentucty, volume 1, W Reid, and Hannah Smith. T W Coleman, Oak Grove, Ky. vol. 1 for himself, and J H Jones, and $1 for S Summer. E Dean, Wooster, Ohio, vol. 1, P Wilson, and P Ambrose. Thomas Weir, Steubenville, vol. 1. Robert Hay, Coshocton, Ohio, vol. 1. L. Hall, Wellsburg, Va. vol. 1. B Morris, Danbury, Connecticut. J G Ellis, Dry Creek, Ky. vol. 1 for himself and James Terrill. J Gaskill, New Lisbon, Ohio, 1 dollar for D Gow. W Poston, Winchester, Ky. vol. 1, T Bush, W B Vivion, P Pool, J Pool, S Hawson, and W Hazlerigg. Mary T Graft, Somerset, Pa. vol. 1, for J Sailor, and Mrs. Louisa S Robbs, and $1 for J Yonkin. H Petway, Nashville, Ten. paid M Norvell, vol. 1. J Richard, jun. Bowler's, Va. vol. 1 for C T Brown. P Smith, Murfreesborough, Ten. vol. 1. Dr. J Vorhes, Bloomfield, Ohio, vol. 1. W D Clark, Orange Court House, Va. paid 1 dollar. S M'Concle, Page's Mill, Ten. vol. 1, J Rutherford, G Dickey, L Scott, J Billingsley, and J Turner. Jos. Carle paid J Mendall, Wellsburg, Va. vol. 1. J Mooney, Bethany, vol. 1. U S Hay, Cross Plains, Ky. vol. 1. A Reynolds, Dripping Spring, Ky. vol. 1, for J Murphy, E Davidson, W Ford, J F Carpenter, and J E Murphy, J. Irvin, Millersburg, Ky. vol. 1 to Thomas Campbell, Sen. for J M Irvin, B M Riggs, H Eades, J Batterton, W Morrow, and himself. J T Jones, Cincinnati, Ohio, vol. 1, for N S Hubbell, R Stout, Mr. Clark, Maria Richardson, and Margaret Dickey. E Barnum, Matthews Court House, Va. vol. 1, for E P Benson, T Hudgens, M Gayle, and Philip Talliafero. J Patton, jun. Paris, Ky. vol. 1, for J G Martin, J Gerrard, J Hazlerigg. D Talbott, and W P Payne. K Newcomb, Plattsburg, New York, vol. 1. Robert Buchanan, Bethany, Va. paid vol. 1 for Wm. West and Charlotte Buchanan.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

☞IN ordering this work for new subscribers, care should be taken that the *post-office* and the *county* should be fairly written out, as well as the name of the persons to whom the work is ordered. In some instances we have to *guess* the name; and in others, to explore the map of a state, or the list of post-offices, in vain, to find the destination. Many hours are lost, and many mistakes are committed, which a fair handwriting would prevent. In the names of persons and places, we have no association of ideas to aid us—nothing but the letters in the name.

To those who write for the press, it is still more necessary that the manuscript should be very legible and free from ambiguities. The reader will please correct, in No. 7, the following *errata*:—

Page 329, after "*potest*," and before "*Cesar*," insert a note of interrogation; so as to read, *Obligare proteum quis potest? Cesar?* Page 323, instead of the "soul of man," read *soil.* Line 4 from top, page 324, for "were," read *was.* Line 14, from top, same page, before "sounds," read *enchanting.*

# THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

{ No. 9. } BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1830. { Vol. 1. }


I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## HISTORY OF SIN,

### INCLUDING THE OUTLINES OF ANCIENT HISTORY.—NO. IV.

IN attempting an historical view of what is commonly called the Medo-Persian Empire, I shall proceed according to the following arrangement:—

I. Give some account of the origin and fortunes of Media and Persia, previous to the birth of Cyrus.

II. The history of Cyrus to the death of Cyaxares, or when Cyrus became sole master of the empire.

III. A view of the great events, or epochas, from the death of Cyaxares to the conquest of Babylon, by Alexander the Great.

IV. The government, arts, sciences, manners, customs, and antiquities of the Persians.

V. Their religion, together with some account of Zoroaster, their prophet.

I. Media is not found on the map of modern Asia. Anciently it was an extensive empire, stretching round the southern and western shores of the Caspian Sea. Eastward lay what is called Tartary, or Central Asia. Persia bounded it South, and Assyria West. Lying between distant parallels of latitude, it was subject to the extremes of heat and cold. The northern provinces, for the most part, buried in snow, and generally barren; but the southern, enjoying a delightful temperature, an almost spontaneously productive soil, insomuch that it may now be considered as the Eden of Persia.

From the best light that can be thrown upon the subject, it appears that Media was peopled by Madai, the son of Japhet, the son of Noah, soon after the dispersion. It gradually grew into a considerable empire, and was finally subjugated by its more powerful neighbor, Assyria, and remained a territorial government for a long time. When the Assyrian Empire was dismembered under Sardanapalus, (B. C. 710.) Media became again independent. From this time to the commencement of the reign of Cyrus, elapsed a period of 156 years, including a succession of five monarchs. Dijoces was the first king. He was succeeded by Phraortes, who reigned 22 years, and fell before Nineveh, in attempting to revenge his father's death.

His son, Cyaxares, an ambitious, wise, and politic prince, resumed the hereditary contest, and after a series of various fortune, in concert with Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, besieged Nineveh, took it, and levelled with the earth that towering monument of human perseverance and glory. Afterwards he carried his victorious arms South as far as Egypt, conquered Persia, and returned to Ecbatania laden with immense spoils, and attended by captive monarchs.

Under this monarch Media became settled into a permanent and powerful empire. Cyaxares, after a reign of 40 years, left his throne to his son Astyages, who is called in scripture Ahasuerus. Astyages gave his daughter Mandane in marriage to Cambyses, a king, or, as he is sometimes called, a nobleman of

Persia. The fruit of this marriage was the illustrious Cyrus, the most faultless prince that ancient history can boast.

Directly South of Media lay an extensive range of territory known in ancient and modern geographies by the name of Persia. It was bounded East by India, South by the Assyrian empires, extending upwards of 1,800 miles in length, and 1,000 in breadth.

The climate of this country varies according to its latitude. In the northern and mountainous regions, especially in the neighborhood of the immense chain of Taurus or Ararat, which traverses Asia from the Black Sea to the bay of Bengal, and which crosses Persia, the air is severely cold; in the central part it is temperate, clear, and very delightful. But the southern provinces lie beneath a constantly burning Sun, and their extended plains are subject to be swept by pestilential winds. Travellers, in all ages, have represented Persia as very populous, and the present estimate is between 30 and 40 millions of people. It is said to embrace upwards of 500 cities and towns, several of which contain from one to three and four hundred thousand inhabitants. Ispahan, or, as it is now called, Spahaun, contains 650,000 inhabitants. Persia is watered by fewer rivers than any other known country of equal extent. This defect, in connexion with corrupt vapors and excessive heats, renders this country generally unwholesome, and gives the Persians a pale and sallow complexion.

We are told in scripture that Persia, or Paras, as it is called by Daniel, was anciently called Elam; and that it was peopled by Elam, the son of Shem, about the time that Media was settled by Madai, at the dispersion.

At the time of Abraham, we find Chedorlaomar, king of Elam, or Persia, a considerable monarch in his day, having conquered several kingdoms of Asia. From this period their authentic history is lost. They were probably early subjugated by the Assyrians, who carried all before them, and remained a long time subject. They afterwards recovered their freedom; but were soon obliged to resign it again to the Medes, as I have already noticed, and remained tributary to them, through their native monarchs, to the time of Cyrus. Cambyses, of the royal family of Achamenaus, married Mandane, the daughter of Astyages, King of Media, and became the father of Cyrus, who was born to free his native country from slavery, to restore the captivity of Jerusalem, and to establish one of the most powerful empires that ever existed in Asia.

II. Cyrus was born in the year before Christ 599. At 12 years of age he accompanied his mother Mandane in a visit to the court of Media. Astyages was soon charmed with the promising appearance of his grandson, insomuch that he retained him in Media, where he remained four or five years. The young plant began already to extend its branches, and promised to become a mighty cedar. The affability of his temper, the simplicity of his deportment, the serenity of his countenance, the sincerity of his heart, and above all, the prowess of his arm, excited the admiration of the court, the camp and the hall. The Medes, both noble and ignoble, proved by their attachment that Cyrus was fully deserving, if not destined, to wear the crown.

At 17 years old he returned to his father's court, followed by the affectionate blessing of the Medes, and welcomed with enthusiasm by his native Persians. In the inconsiderable wars which were at times waged with neighboring nations, Cyrus was always victorious, always generously rewarded the brave, always mercifully spared the conquered. As his father Cambyses advanced in age, he gradually associated Cyrus with him in the government, the burden of which he was obliged to bear. Thus he lived till he was 40 years old. But the prime of his life was not uselessly wasted; a new era in the military tactics of Persia began with him. A course of discipline was established which, in a short time, rendered the Persians the best soldiers in Asia. The arts of peace were cultivated, civilization rapidly advanced, and this barbarous, enslaved, and unimportant people, under the transforming genius of Cyrus, suddenly became so formidable that they were accused by their neighbors of already aspiring to the dominion of Asia.

Astyages, the king of Media, died, and left his dominions to his son Cyaxares, who was but one year older than Cyrus. Nereglissar, the king of Babylon, pursuing the council of his predecessors, thought the death of Astyages a favorable crisis to aim an exterminating stroke at the growing power of Media, levied an immense army of 250,000 men from the populous regions West of the Euphrates, and placed himself at their head. Cyaxares having lately assumed the reigns of government, was justly alarmed at their extensive preparations, which threatened not only to rob him of crown and empire, but suddenly to extinguish his flattering expectations that Media would rise to the empire of Asia. Unterrified, however, by the awful crisis, he rapidly concentrated his forces, with the resolution of extreme resistance, and sent for aid into Persia, with an express demand that Cyrus should be invested with the command of the auxiliaries.

The demand met with a prompt compliance. From the peculiar manner in which Cyrus levied his army, we may suppose his comprehensive genius already embraced, in a measure, that vast scheme of conquest which he afterwards executed. He first chose 200 of those who, from childhood, had been his companions in toil and ease, to be the commanders of his army. He then commanded each of the 200 to choose four men for subordinate officers, which amounted to 1,000. Finally, each of the four chose 30 of the best soldiers he could find. When all were marshalled, they amounted to 31,000. An army thus appointed, might well be capable of great achievements.

At the head of this body Cyrus joined his uncle Cyaxares, already preparing to march. In joint command they moved towards the borders of Assyria, after Cyrus had reduced the king of Arminia, from a revolt, obtained in the father an immoveable ally, and in the son, the interesting Tigranes, a bosom friend.

Nereglissar, the king of Babylon, having concentrated an immense force of 200,000 foot and 60,000 horse, advanced towards Media and met the Medes and Persians, of not half their number, not far from the boundaries of the two empires. A general battle was fought, and Cyrus was completely victorious. For although Cyaxares had an equal command, yet the masterly genius of Cyrus demanded and obtained the undivided honor of the laurel.

The unfortunate king of Babylon was slain, and Crœsus, king of Lydia, who succeeded to the command, was driven in confusion from the field, his army dispersed, and his camp abandoned to the Medes and Persians. Such was the fortune of the first campaign, which gave a strong complexion to the succeeding contest. The throne of Babylon was immediately filled by Laborosoarchod, whose cruelties, in a few months, urged his subjects to seek a last redress, by sacrificing him to their vengeance. Labynit, or, as he is called in Scripture, Belshazzar, was crowned in his stead. Belshazzar appears to have been a voluptuous and wicked prince, careless of the great duties of a monarch, and intent only upon the pleasures of sense: but he had a partner equal to the grand employment. Nitocles, his mother, inherited the great talents of her father, Nebuchadnezzar, and, by a vigorous administration, protracted for some time the fate of her abandoned son. Her name stands upon the records of time, in the list of women who have been able, by a supremacy of genius, to preserve the honor of the throne—to give momentum to the concerns of an extensive empire, and beautifully to blend the delicacy of a female with the majesty of a crown.

In the mean time a vigorous plan of operations was pursued by Cyrus in reducing the strong holds of the Assyrians, and gradually preparing an unobstructed march to Babylon. The remonstrances of Nitocles, seconded by the near approach of the Persians, roused the Assyrian king to prevent, if possible, the fall of his empire. Aided by immense treasures and extensive alliances, he formed a combination of powers to overwhelm the Persians at once, and levied an army of 420,000 men from Egypt to the shores of the Euxine. Crœsus, king of Lydia, was appointed to the supreme command. Lydia was a small kingdom on the eastern shore of the Ægean Sea, northwest from Babylon.

Crœsus, its king, was one of the ablest generals of his time, and was also the greatest patron of science, being the intimate friend of almost all the philosophers of the age, and so rich that his name, even among us, is a common proverb. The place of general rendezvous was Thymbra, a small town not far from Sardis, the capital of Lydia, on the river Pactolus.

No sooner did Cyrus hear of the vast force that was concentrating against him, than he determined upon one of those plans, the success of which depends not upon physical strength, but celerity of execution. With about 30,000 men, he immediately marched across the broad territories of the Assyrians, 1200 miles, in quest of 400,000. He found them at Thymbra, and without hesitation offered them battle. When the line of battle was formed, Crœsus perceived that he might easily surround the Persians, and made an effort accordingly. The wings were commanded to wheel and attack the Persians in flank and rear. But the penetrating eye of Cyrus quickly saw and defeated the plan. He disposed his columns, so that they fought without disorder, and presented a formidable front in every direction. After a short and close conflict, the wings of the Assyrian army gave way, and were pursued with great slaughter. But 100,000 Egyptians, forming the centre of the army, in close order, sheltered by a bridge of shields, firmly resisted, and threatened fatally to shake the Persian columns. The Persian army was already fringed with the slain, and the hardy Egyptians were upon the point of breaking their central front, when Cyrus returned from the fierce pursuit, animated with the certainty of victory. Perceiving that this was the eventful moment, he fell with the force of a mountain torrent upon the flank of the Egyptians, who fought with unabated fury. Thousands after thousands fell, and would have continued to fall, had not Cyrus, who well knew the passive bravery of the Egyptians, and regretting that such excellent soldiers should thus perish, without benefit to themselves or their cause, offered them terms which they could not with honor decline. They not only submitted to the victor, but immediately volunteered in his service, and from that time became a distinguished section of his army.

Thus closed the famous battle of Thymbra: another bloody wreath to bind the brow of Cyrus, and established his fame as the first warrior upon the theatre of the world. This battle decided the fate of Lesser Asia. Cyrus pursued his fortune: Arabia and Syria successfully fell before him, till at length, the great Babylon stood alone upon the banks of the Euphrates, and frowned upon the conqueror, angry at his past success, and defying his future attempts.

The same Providence which had before made known, by the mouths of Isaiah and Daniel, that Babylon should fall, had endued Cyrus with a mind not to be diverted by apparent difficulties; not to be frustrated by real impediments. He encamped before the city, and commenced a regular siege. Here we must again admire that activity and expansion of mind which suggested the adoption of a stratagem completely successful. Among the many monuments of the power and wisdom of Nebuchadnezzar, there was one which now became the means of the fall of Babylon. At some distance from the city, there were immense reservoirs, dug for the purpose of receiving the redundant water of the Euphrates, and of preventing the fatal effects of occasional inundations. Several canals formed a communication between these reservoirs and the river. By opening these canals, the water might easily be turned from its natural course, the bed of the river be left dry, and a free passage into the heart of the city laid open.

The public festivals of the Babylonians were generally celebrated with the most extravagant riot, drunkenness, and debauchery, and frequently continued several days without intermission. Cyrus chose the night preceding one of these festivals for the execution of his plan. The course of the river was suddenly stopped; the army, in two divisions, in silence marched under the wall upon the North and South sides of the city, defeated the feeble resistance of a few drunken guards, and, without loss of blood, introduced themselves into the midst of that proud capital.

While Cyrus was taking undisputed possession of the city, a scene of a different character was passing in the palace of Belshazzar. This devoted monarch had, as usual, invited the nobles of his court, and the princes of the Empire to a splendid entertainment. Nothing was wanting to increase the pleasure of the eye, of the ear, of the palate. They exhausted the golden goblets, which were sacrilegiously plundered from the temple of Jerusalem—they appeased their appetites with the most luscious viands—they listened to strains of lascivious music. When, suddenly, an awful vision struck them into a death-like silence—A hand, the finger of God, appeared writing upon the wall, "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin." The astrologers, the interpreters, the Magi, who used to fill the ear of Belshazzar with dreams and predictions of his future glory, were astonished and dumb at the sight. Till, at length, Daniel, the prophet of Jehovah, who had long and faithfully served the king, in the quality of prime minister, addressed the terrified monarch. He firmly reproved him for his idolatrous, wicked, and abandoned life—he appealed to the enormous crimes he had been guilty of against his miserable subjects, and against God;—then, pointing to the inscription on the wall, he thus spoke: "This is the interpretation of the thing. God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it; thou art weighed in the balances, and found wanting; thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians."

Cyrus was already at the gates of the palace. The alarm was sounded, and the impious Belshazzar, rushing from the hall, sword in hand, was met by the Persians, and instantly cut to pieces, with all his attendants. When the last Sun descended, this proud monarch looked from his lofty battlements, and knew not, or thought not, of an arm that was able to humble. At midnight, from the midst of revelry, he is called to answer the demands of retributive justice.

The death of Belshazzar, as you have already heard, put a period to the second Assyrian Empire, B. C. 536. The reduction of Babylon was followed by the submission of all the Assyrian territories, and the Empire of Cyrus was bounded North by the Caspian and Black seas, East by India, South by the Arabian Sea and Ethiopia, and West by Lybia, the Mediterranean, and Archipelago; comprehending Asia Minor Syria, Egypt, Arabia, Assyria, Armenia, Media, and Persia; embracing, as Gibbons says of the Roman Empire, in after ages, "the fairest parts of the earth, and the most civilized portion of mankind." Cyrus and Cyaxares, or, as he is called in Scripture, Darius the Mede, in a short time established the government upon an immoveable basis. They divided the empire into 120 provinces, according to the prophet, and appointed satrapæ, or governors over them. Three persons were also, from among the wisest men in the kingdom, selected to inspect the conduct of the satraps, and render an account to the king. The first of these was Daniel, the prophet, universally acknowledged as the wisest man in the East. He was exalted to the high station of prime minister by Nebuchadnezzar, and had served in that capacity 65 years. How different an aspect would the world now wear, could such men be chosen to direct the affairs of nations!

Two years after the fall of Babylon, Cyaxares, the uncle, and Cambyses, the father of Cyrus, died, and he was left sole master of the new Empire, B. C. 534. [*Whelpley's Lectures.*]

## JOURNAL OF A TRAVELLER.

[*Continued from page* 348.]

### OHIO.

*June 23d.* A LITTLE past 12 o'clock A. M. arrived at F——, where, being informed that it was only eight miles to Judge C. to whom I had a letter of introduction, concluded to stop here—got to Judge C's about dark—was welcomed with much christian kindness. Judge C. and wife had been Baptist professors for many years: but

now, with seven children, they are members of the new church, set in order in that place by Bishop S. R. They tell me much of the reformation effected in these parts by the proclamation of the gospel —of a happy three days' meeting of disciples, which dissolved on Monday last, K. Present many who had been converted from different sects—several teachers—among whom were Brother Williams, *formerly* a Universalist, Brothers Allton and Church, christians; Brother Curtis, a Methodist; Brothers Bentley, Collins, Porter, Rigdon, and Barr, Regular Baptists; but *now*, all united on the *one foundation*, having been all immersed by *one immersion* into *the one faith* of the gospel. Including these I am informed, that no less than TWENTY PUBLIC TEACHERS, of different denominations, on the Reserve, have, within three years, renounced their respective *isms*, and become *one* in Christ Jesus. At this meeting, *nine* new disciples were added, and one old one made over from the Baptists; some of whom were immersed after 11 o'clock at night. Sister C. gave me a very interesting account of Brother Vaughn, a young Methodist preacher, who had been discipled by Bishop A. C. His subsequent proclamation of the gospel, persecution, trial and expulsion, by his quondam brethren.

*June 24th.* Was introduced by Brother C. to Bishop R. with whom I had a very agreeable visit. He tells me, that within two years past, he has immersed about 1000 persons, constituted 15 or 20 churches, and rebaptized some, to answer a good conscience, who had been previously immersed; but of these a few. Sister C. says, she thinks that the disciples have an advantage over the sectarians, in being free to examine the scriptures for themselves—that they do not consider themselves perfect; and, therefore, are continually seeking for more light. P. M. visited Brother Collins—Had a long and interesting interview with him.

*June 26th.* Read a part of No. 11. vol. 1. "Christian Evidences, by AYLETT RAINS." From which the following are extracts:—

"At the Mahoning Association, about five months after my immersion, I was publicly questioned relative to my sentiments; and from a bench on which I stood, I did not hesitate to declare to the whole congregation, that it was still my *opinion* that all men would finally become holy and happy. This fact can be proved by scores of witnesses.

"I shall never, as long as I retain my memory, forget the magnanimity of Messrs. Campbells and Scott, and several others, exhibited on this occasion. They acted as men of noble minds, highly elevated above the paltry bickerings of speculative partizans; for though they considered my Restorationist sentiments as a vagary of my brain, they did not treat me with contempt, as bigots would have done; but with meekness and kindness encouraged me to persevere in the christian race. And Alexander Campbell, also, invited me to pay him a visit at his own house, in order that he might have opportunity to convince me that the doctrine of Universal Restoration is not taught in the scriptures.

"The fact is, that from the period of my embracing the primitive "form of sound words," I was resolved to take no position on any doctrinal point, far removed from that centre which is the grand attractive of christianity. I stood therefore on gospel facts, and taught the unequivocal testimonies of Christ and his Apostles concerning those facts, requiring all who had ears to hear to submit unreservedly to the commands of Jesus, and thereby obtain all the rewards which are promised to the obedient, and shun those evils, whatever they might be, which are consequent on disobedience.

"Thus did I reason; and thus have I labored for the welfare of mankind; and I thank God, that my labor has not been in vain. I have seen men, who were philosophically Calvinists, and Arminians, and Restorationists, members of the same congregation, and sitting around the same table of the Lord; and in the joyful fervors of the same christian love, attracted by the one cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, praising God in concert, and there were no divisions among them! O, what a sight was this! How noble an object to be sought! My soul takes fire while I write, and as the flame increases, resolution on resolution arises, that while life shall last, I will never let go my hold of this gospel, which so happily terminates in such exquisite peace and good will to men!

"I have long enough been tossed about on the billows of the ocean of error! I have found a foundation of facts;—facts more permanent than the foundations of the Andes or the Allegany. I am resolved here to abide. Here I have terminated my zigzag journey from Babylon to Jerusalem. Here, at the foot of the cross, I have laid my burden: and here until mortal life shall cease, I will stand, and contemplate the wonders of redeeming love. Gospel facts are immutable things; like the rock of ages, they never move! Human opinions and imaginations may undergo their daily mutations—may sink into oblivion, and be known no more at all; but these facts can never change."

Between 2 and 3 o'clock P. M. bade brother Collins good bye, and returned to M. Spent the evening till 10 o'clock at Bishop R's. He now began and gave me a history of the reformation, and of the actors in it from the commencement.

* * *

*Lord's day June 27th.* Was introduced to Father J. B. who, for many years, had been a Methodist preacher, and who, about a year since, obeyed the gospel. Attended worship with the disciples in M. Their meeting-house is a plain, one story, brick building, 52 by 42 feet, furnished with seats. The males on one side, and the females on the other. While the assembly were coming in, several hymns were sung. At length Bishop R. arose—read John xv. ch. and prayed. Another hymn was sung—Bishop R. then, after making some introductory remarks, named for his subject, *obedience.* He exhibited Jesus as the Lord of Lords and King of Kings—considered the gospel as addressed to all without exception, who hear it; and enforced its exhortations with the promise of life and salvation. His

discourse was one hour and three quarters in length; at the close of which, he said: "If there be any here present, who wish to obey the gospel, they will come forward while we are singing a hymn." Two sisters came forward—one a married lady, the other about 14 years of age. After a short prayer, Bishop R. said; "We will now repair immediately to the water." At the water, on the candidates presenting themselves, he addressed them thus: "Do you believe with all your heart, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God?" They answered, "I do." Then taking each by the hand, they went down both into the water, when, saying —"By the authority of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, I immerse you into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit"—he immersed them. On returning to the meeting-house, about one hundred disciples sat down to the table of the Lord, (which is their weekly practice) and commemorated his dying love. Traveller joined with them. During this exercise, they sung several hymns and spiritual songs. None seemed sad—none wore other than a cheerful countenance—never before, as now, was the exhortation of the Apostle so much impressed upon my mind:—"Rejoice in the Lord *always;* and again I say rejoice."

But, here, in copying, I break short off, to address my Baptist brethren from another place.

* * *

VIRGINIA.

*My Dear Friends,*

I am a *Baptist*, the son of a Baptist. For more than fourteen years, I have been numbered with you; and now, I am as truly one of you, as was Paul a *Pharisee*, when he stood before the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, subsequent to his conversion to christianity, and declared himself a Pharisee. He then believed in the resurrection of the dead, the great doctrine which divided the Jews into Pharisees and Sadducees. So do I believe in the immersion only of believers upon a profession of faith, the great doctrine which now divides christendom into Baptists and Paidobaptists. But, as Paul was at that time something more than a Pharisee—a Christian; so do I hope, now am I. I believe not only in immersion, as an act of *obedience* to Christ; but in immersion *into* the name of the Holies, *for the remission of sins, and for the gift of the Holy Spirit.* I now see, or think I see, more in this sacred institution than I at first saw. I see in it a gracious pledge of pardon to the obedient. Yes, I now believe in immersion for the remission of sins. This is one of the "points," on which, seventeen months ago, I was unsettled—which I wished "to investigate impartially and thoroughly; that I might ascertain, and embrace, and practise, and inculcate, the whole truth upon it." And, believe me, brethren, my present views are the result of *such an investigation.* My first, and last, and great work of appeal, in this matter, has been the New Testament Scriptures. I have sat down to them, and made them my study from morning till night. I have sought for the truth as for hid treasure, prized it

more than silver and gold; and I feel assured, that I have found it—at least, on one of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ—on *baptism*. Seeing now, in a believing immersion the oath and promise of Him who cannot lie, of pardon and the Holy Spirit; all my former darkness, doubts, and despondency, have vanished away; and I rejoice in God my Saviour with joy unspeakable, and full of glory. And will you not rejoice with me? Will you not also yourselves believe, and enjoy this blessedness? I must here give another extract from my Journal.

*June 30th.* "*Disciples*," yes; this is the name by which they call one another. "*The congregation of disciples* in M. in W. in N. L." &c. They speak of *obeying the gospel*—of obeying it, by being *immersed for the remission of their sins*. Yes; and they are, indeed, disciples—*disciples of Christ*. They have learned of Him to love one another. For one week that I have been among them, I have sung more, and heard more singing, than in a month before. Yes; *disciples of Christ!* They own no other master, and to call them by the name of any man is to calumniate them. In no one family did I find a complete set of the works of A. C. and in most of those I visited, not a single volume of his, beside his hymn-book. Brother Collins, "*the Campbellite*," owned only this; and yet, I observed in his library a complete set of the works of Andrew Fuller!! These, sister C. informed me, he had read a great deal more than the works of A. C. *Query*—Why not rather call him a *Fullerite?* But, no;—the NEW TESTAMENT is now his Confession of Faith. Show me *your* faith, by your Philadelphia Confession, by your contentions for orthodoxy, by your Papal anathemas against you know not what; and I will show you *their* faith, by their works.

"On carrying some corn and other provisions to a poor woman in our neighborhood, who was very much prejudiced against us," said Brother M. "she wondered what it meant." "We are taught to do thus by our religion," he replied. ☞Brother M. was the first who obeyed the gospel in K. in the month of September, 1827.

In the month of March last, Brother T. C. addressing the congregation at E. on loving, not only in word and in tongue; but in deed, and in truth—observed, "We should not say to our brothers, Be ye warmed, and be ye fed, without giving them those things which are necessary for them." Another Brother M. arose and said, "the doctrine is good;" and inquired, whether the disciples knew of any one among them, to whose necessities they might administer. A sister D. was named, of the Methodist church. The very next day Brother M. for his part, sent the flour of a bushel of wheat, some dried peaches, &c. ☞This Brother M. was the first, who arose to obey the gospel in E. after it had been faithfully proclaimed there by Bishop R. The same evening several others arose; among whom were the wife of Brother M. then a Presbyterian, and two of the children of Dr. D. Brother M. previous to this, was a frequent reviler of the Bible, and of those who believed in it.

The next morning after these eight were discipled, just before

Bishop R. left the place, he turned to Dr. D. (then in connexion with the Regular Baptists) and said; "Will you not go with them; or will you abandon them to go alone?"——"I will go with them," said he: and from that time, he has been numbered with the disciples. ☞This Dr. D. was so much exercised when his sectarian shackles began to break, when introduced into the liberty of the gospel, that he could not sleep—after retiring to bed, he got up and read his Bible, and sung, and prayed one whole night. ☞This Dr. D. the last year subscribed $20 towards the support of the Baptist minister in E. which, he says, (though he has but a few times heard him, and the minister has not since visited his house;) he means to pay. He thinks of visiting the minister, and of carrying the pay to him.

Soon after the last of Judge C's children obeyed the gospel, Bishop R. being apprized that he had indulged many fears of this way; turned to him and asked: "What he thought of it." He burst into tears and replied, "Who am I that I should withstand God?" Judge C. also, is now numbered with the disciples.

There is, indeed, a charm and a power in the ancient gospel, which they (who oppose it) know not of. It is producing wonders. Churches are springing up like corn all over the country by its influences. Since writing the above, I have myself seen a Methodist minister submit to the yoke of Jesus who went home in his wet clothes, not having calculated to be immersed when he came to the place of hearing. On the same day, an elder, also, of high standing in the Presbyterian church; and subsequently, several others, both male and female. But believe not merely on human testimony; call no man master; take nothing upon trust; believe Christ, believe Peter, believe Paul.

At some future day I may give further extracts from my Journal; in the mean while, hear a Doctor: "Take heed to yourselves what you are about to do. With regard to the present affairs, I say unto you refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will moulder away; but if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it. FRANCIS.

*Bethany, July 24th,* 1830.

---

*Extracts from Carlile's Life of Paine, selected by "A Traveller."*

Thomas Paine was born at Thetford, England on the 29th day of January, 1737, and died at New York, on the 8th of June, 1809, aged a little over 72 years and 4 months. In his last will and testament, dated January 18th, 1809, he says: "I have lived an honest and useful life to mankind; my time has been spent in doing good, and I die in perfect composure and resignation to the will of my Creator God.

William Cobbet says of the *Tract* on the wretched end of Thomas Paine: "The whole as far as relates to recantation, and to the *unhappy French female,* is a lie from the begining to the end."

DR. FRANKLIN, in a letter addressed to Mrs. Mecom his sister, (1748) says: "'Tis pity that good works, among some sorts of people, are so little valued, and good words admired in their stead. I mean seemingly pious discourses, instead of benevolent actions. Those they most put out of countenance, by calling morality *rotten morality* —righteousness *ragged* righteousness, and even filthy rags—and when you mention virtue, pucker up their noses; at the same time that they eagerly snuff up an empty canting harangue, as if it was a posey of the choicest flowers."

THOMAS JEFFERSON, in a letter to Dr. Priestly, (dated Wasington, April 9th, 1803) says of Christ:—"His character and doctrines have received still greater injury from those who pretend to be his spiritual disciples, and who have disfigured and sophisticated his actions and precepts from views of personal interest, so as to induce the unthinking part of mankind to throw off the whole system in disgust, and pass sentence as an impostor on the most innocent, the most benevolent, the most eloquent and sublime character that has ever been exhibited to man."

CARLILE remarks: "Hired priests, no doubt, consider themselves in a measure bound to deal out to their hearers a great deal of school divinity, consisting of perplexing metaphysics, in order to convince them that they get the worth of their money. Plain morality would not command a high price among those who are in search of mysteries, miracles, and spiritual nonentities. *Ibid.*

*For the Millennial Harbinger.*

## REGENERATION—*No. V.*

IN Eden's bright and unsullied mirror we have contemplated the original state and character of man. Glory, honor, and beauty rested upon the image presented to us; for white-robed Innocence had clothed our first parents with all her charms, and the whole creation contributed to their enjoyment.

We are now presented with a different picture. No sooner had the Tempter introduced those evil principles which prompted to disobedience, than the earth is commanded to reveal man's altered condition. For his sake God cursed the ground; and the soil which, once pure, afforded nothing but what could increase his joys, now watered with his tears and with his blood, brings forth to him thorns and thistles. Spontaneously it once produced for him every thing necessary to perpetuate existence; now he is informed that in the sweat of his face he shall eat bread. The sparkling drops of dew with which the early mist watered the face of the smiling garden, shone like tears of joy upon the cheek of Beauty; but now the hoarse tempest utters its fearful voice, and the fierce winds and streaming torrents spread terror and devastation over the trembling land.

The analogy between the present condition of man and that of the place of his abode, is so evident that it is unnecessary to pursue it; and although there may be some, who, because they cannot under-

stand how evil first originated, profess to doubt its existence, and neglect the means by which it is to be removed; yet the very soil they tread on—the whole of nature travailing in pain, reveals their character, and they themselves are the living refutation of their doctrine. We know as little of the origin of good as of the origin of evil. But our want of information upon this subject cannot be an argument against either the fact of their former origin or the truth of their present existence; *for ignorance is not a foundation for either faith or incredulity.* Nor can it be made a spring of action, since that person would act irrationally, who, because he could not discover the ultimate cause of hunger, would doubt its existence, and refuse to receive that food which was intended to remove it. The terms are entirely relative. Evil is used in opposition to good; good, with respect to evil. Adam knew neither before eating the forbidden fruit. The existence of the Arch Apostate had already made angels acquainted with the effects of these principles. "Behold," says God after the fall, "the man has become like one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever, the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken." We do know good and evil: our senses continually apprize us of their existence; and all men are laboring, as it were by necessity, to enjoy pleasure and to avoid pain.

Indeed, we appear to have been so constituted as to learn by contrast and estimate every thing by comparison. The gloom of midnight prepares us to appreciate the radiance of noon day. The piercing cold of stormy Winter enables us to enjoy the grateful warmth of Summer's glowing ray. We measure beauty by deformity; and, as the skillful painter, by a judicious application of dark shades, causes every feature of his original to rise from the smooth canvass and stand forth in bold and beautiful relief; so are we able to display the true character and merit of an object when we are in possession of that with which we can contrast it.

It is thus that we become acquainted with the glorious Creator of the Universe. Acquainted with evil, we know that he is good. Experiencing hatred, we are fitted to discover that God is love; and beholding the effects of cruelty, we are enabled in some degree to estimate the mercy of our Divine Father. The existence of imbecility and folly; injustice and avarice; pride and vanity, only serve to exhibit more conspicuously to us the superlative excellence of the character of God: his power and wisdom—his justice and liberality —his humility and condescension: and when he is revealed to us as far as our present nature enables us to comprehend him; when by, opposing power to power, wisdom to wisdom, perseverance to perseverance in counteracting the designs of that rebellious angel who dared to claim equality, he has sufficiently made known, or given to us *data* by means of which we can forever contemplate with delight the glory, honor, and majesty that surround his throne:—when the seed of the woman, the Prophet, Priest, and King, whom God

hath set up to teach, to mediate, and to reign, clothed with the same human nature over which Satan originally seemed to triumph, and combatting that enemy with the same means (his word) which he had successfully used against our first mother, shall have put all power, authority, and dominion under his feet, and reign as King upon his holy hill of Zion; then shall evil be destroyed; death and hell shall be cast into the lake of fire, and a voice shall be heard, saying, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men! and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying; neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." And he that sat upon the throne said, "Behold I make all things new."

Seeing, then, that our first parents were already acquainted with the character of God as far as their circumstances enabled them to discover it, a being was introduced to them, the exhibition of whose vile, debasing, and pernicious powers, has tended to show forth to us in a more striking manner, the pure, glorious, and exalted attributes of the Most High.

Having had no experience of falsehood, they were ignorant of truth; and, like children who had never been deceived, they required no testimony. With unhesitating confidence they therefore received the declarations of God, and with the same unsuspecting simplicity they yielded credence to the assertions of the Tempter. "The serpent said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said you shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, You shall not eat of it, neither shall you touch it lest you die. And the serpent said unto the woman, You shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day you eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and you shall be as gods knowing good and evil."

If we examine the manner in which man's fall was occasioned, we will perceive that it was by perverting the powers with which he was gifted. The principles of his mind and the passions of his soul are, unless viewed in connexion with their objects, neither good nor evil. Thus love is in itself neither meritorious nor disgraceful, and becomes so only as it is extended to an object more or less deserving of our affection. And it is a law of our nature, both moral and corporeal, that the lawful exercise of desire should be productive of harmony and joy, while its direction to an interdicted or improper object inevitably occasions misery and confusion.

Perceiving, then, that the minds and affections of our first parents were entirely engrossed with the idea of God and the blessings which he had bestowed upon them, the Tempter, while on the one hand he strove to weaken their confidence in God by contradicting his declaration; on the other endeavored to withdraw their love from God by fixing it upon themselves. No sooner were his words believed, than

the desire of self-aggrandizement diffused its poisonous influence through their souls, while that by which the passion was to be gratified presented itself in all the charms which variety and glowing anticipation could bestow: "And when she saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her and he did eat."

Thus was the revolution effected in the condition of man. His state was changed. It was once that of innocence—it now is that of guilt. It is said, therefore, that he "died," or "fell," terms expressive of a complete change of condition. His change of state produced a change of character, and no longer rejoicing to stand before his Maker, he feared when he heard the voice of the Lord God, and sought to avoid his presence. Guilt prompts the offender to flee as far as possible from the person against whom the offence is committed; the farther he retires from his presence the more ignorant he becomes of his character, and the more he fears and the more ignorant he becomes, the more he hates the object of his alarm.

To the history of the world we may refer for the perfect exhibition of the present character of man. Under the influence of evil principles, of stormy passions, and wicked propensities, his life presents us with nothing but misery, crime, and sorrow. Self is now his idol, purity his sacrifice, and flattery his incense. Intended for love, he was denied arms; but he hath forged them for himself to combat his fellow. Despising the hand that feeds and clothes him, he esteems his deceiver and reveres his oppressor. Dissatisfied with the present, he regrets the past, and trembles at the thought of futurity. He alone, of the animal creation, possesses the idea of the existence of God, and self-interest and wickedness from a thought so simple and so consoling, have overspread the world with swarms of inhuman religions and idle superstitions. More cruel than the tempest that howls along the sky, he ravages with fire and sword the fairest portions of the globe, and delights in the torture, the wheel, and the faggot. The Prince of Darkness rules in the hearts of the children of disobedience; the simplicity of nature is perverted; the natural relations of things are entirely changed; and every principle and passion is presented with some unlawful object, difficult of acquisition and injurious in enjoyment. DISCIPULUS.

## Philalethes on the Scriptures.

[*Continued from page* 340.]

9. IT* engenders, on the one hand, vanity and self-conceit, and often pride and haughtiness, in preachers; and on the other, adulation, servility, and worshipping of men in the people. Nothing can be more contemptible and disgusting than the unmanly, fulsome flattery, coaxing, cringing, and canting, which constitute generally the intercourse between pastors and people, when the pastors are dependent

**Human means of religious instruction.*

on the flock for a support; nothing more offensive than the indifference, pride, and superciliousness of the priesthood, when they are independent.

10. It diverts attention from God's word. So long, so loudly, and so artfully have the different elements of this clerical contrivance been extolled by its deeply interested inventors and patrons, that it is now generally considered to be more necessary and useful than even the Bible itself; and, of course, much greater attention, and incomparably more time are devoted to it than to sacred writ. Where is the christian that does not spend vastly more time in reading and hearing one or other of these human divines, than he spends in reading and hearing God's unadulterated message?

11. It fetters scriptural inquiry. The people, artfully seduced to believe that they cannot understand God's message without the explanatory labors of the clergy, are naturally deterred from inquiring what it means or declares to them, (than which a more pernicious falsehood was never propagated on earth.) But beside suppressing individual and private inquiry, and tempting unthinking creatures to despise Christ's express command to read, search, and meditate the Scriptures in order to procure religious information, it makes them depend on the notions, opinions, and tales of the Clergy, instead of God's immediate and explicit declarations, for their faith and practice, and, of course, for the salvation of their souls. Yes, multitudes—millions are prevented by this cruel deception from reading and consulting daily, as their best interest, not less than their bounden duty requires, God's inspired instrument of instruction, and are betrayed to depend for their religious information on the stated, uninspired harangues of fallible men. To this fatal delusion, to this gross falsehood, that the Bible, in order to be understood by the illiterate, needs the explanatory labors of the clergy, or of any human being, more than to any other cause, are the most astonishing and most lamentable ignorance and inefficacy of that book to be ascribed. Were the Bible, instead of being undervalued, neglected, and almost contemned, esteemed, praised, recommended, and exclusively sought and trusted to, how different would its effects on the human race become.

12. It generates among the professed followers of Christ an impure or mixed faith—a faith built partly on divine and certain information, and partly on human notions, opinions, conjectures, inferences, &c. in the truth of which no confidence can or ought to be reposed. How small is the number of christians whose faith rests solely on divine declaration, and yet divine declaration alone can form a proper and sure foundation for faith to rest upon. Were all the spurious faith, that is, all the faith which has no better foundation than human *say so*, to be cast out of the christian community, what a small morsel would be left! The christian who derives all his religious information directly from the word of God, has the consolation to know that his faith rests on the unerring knowledge and infallible veracity of his Maker; but he who derives his information from the harangues or writings of his clerical instructers, ought to remember that their *sagacity*, however little it may be, is all he has to depend upon.

13. It robs the *saints* of their noblest privilege and their highest honor. To them, without discrimination, has Christ entrusted his work on earth, and allowed them to perform every act of which it consists; for to them, without distinction, has he committed the work called "*the service*," and "*the building up of the body of Christ:*" Dan. vii. 18, 22. Ephes. iv. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 2. But the clerical system subverts this fair, equitable institution of the Redeemer, and teaches that not the saints, but a few favorites, selected, prepared, appointed, and commissioned by their fellow-men, are exclusively entrusted and honored with Christ's work. True it is, these favored few pretend to defend the high distinction which they claim under another peculiar favor—a divine call. But what does this pretended call, when examined, turn out to be? To be neither more nor less than that which belongs to every saint—to every believer on earth. For in the breast and character of every lover of the Lord Jesus is every ingredient of their call to be found in an equal, if not in a higher degree. Well, then, if the elements which constitute their call belong to every believer, is not every believer called to do his Master's work as well as they?

14. By the clerical system the saints are driven from their Master's work. The saints have long been tempted to believe that only a mere fragment of their Sovereign's work, and that of the lowest quality, has been entrusted to them; that all the important, dignified, and profitable part, has been reserved for the honor and emolument of a few favorites. They (I mean saints) may lawfully grieve in secret, lament, weep, and mourn over the unprosperous condition of their Lord's affairs, but durst not attempt to exert one of their fingers to bring them into a better state. That labor the clergy have seized on as their peculiar inheritance, and suspended a curse over the head of the impious saint who should dare to invade their right. To us, say they, are committed *exclusively*, by the most unaccountable system of partiality and favoritism heaven ever beheld, the admission of members into Christ's visible kingdom, sexual alliance, the time, place, and manner of the commemorative supper, the celebration of the Lord's day, the time, place, duration, and acts of social worship, the terms of communion, the means or acts of religious instruction, the trial, punishment, and restoration of offenders; in short, the entire direction and government of the Redeemer's visible kingdom. How this clerical oligarchy comports with the declarations of the Holy Spirit in Danl. vii. 18, 22. Ephes. iv. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 2, I have not sagacity enough to discover; but, perhaps, some clergyman who has long been in the practice of solving enigmas and riddles, and splitting metaphysical hairs, may remove the difficulty. In Daniel the *saints*, not the *clergy*, are promised the kingdom: In Ephesians iv. 12. the work called "*the service*," and "*the building up of the body of Christ*," are expressly committed to them; and in 2 Tim. ii. 2. the work is committed to the faithful men; but "faithful" is an epithet which belongs to every saint. As things, however, have long been, and still are, both the kingdom and the service have been entirely engrossed by

the clergy; and the saints, instead of enjoying the kingdom as promised them, have long been, and still are, only slaves, vassals and subjects of their more highly favored superiors.

15. By this unjust and oppressive contrivance, the zeal of Christ's warmest friends has been rendered abortive in every age. Induced to believe that his Master has assigned him nothing of any moment to do---nothing that can directly and effectually promote his Master's interest—the slighted and discouraged believer devotes to idleness or worldly pursuits that time and those powers, which, had a just share of his Master's service been in his apprehension entrusted to him, he would gladly and sedulously have spent in its performance. Thus in spiritual, as well as in worldly matters, favoritism produces the worst of consequences. While it disgusts, alienates, and disheartens one servant, it puffs up another with pride and arrogance, with vanity and self-conceit. Yes, according to the high pretensions set up, and the superiority arrogated by the clergy, the unclerical believer, be he ever so pious and friendly, ever so desirous to see the cause of his Redeemer triumphant, ever so capable to promote it, or ever so willing to spend and be spent in its promotion, has truly but little encouragement held out to him, either in this world or the next, in comparison of that set before his more highly favored superiors, the clergy. Believe them, and they are now, and for ever will be, exalted to seats much nearer God's right hand, and enjoy the divine favor in a much higher degree than their unclerical vassals, and merely because they are unclerical slaves.

16. It lengthens immensely the weary traveller's journey. The way prescribed by God to heaven and happiness is both short and easy. The Bible is but a small and plain book. But the way prescribed by the clergy is of enormous length and rugged passage, enough to deter a Sir William Jones, not to say a poor, feeble, distracted believer, to travel over all the creeds, confessions, catechisms, tracts, sermons, lectures, discourses, orations, arguments, expositions, paraphrases, commentaries, annotations, bodies of human divinity of terrific size, and other countless productions, all of which it seems the clergy deem it necessary for the man who sets his face heavenward to peruse, or why be at the labor of composing, publishing, enjoining and urging the use of them. Surely if all these be not necessary to give the religious inquirer that knowledge of God and divine things which his eternal happiness requires, nothing can be more cruel, nothing more absurd than their prescription; and if all these be necessary, and certainly if any one of them be necessary, all must be; for should the religious inquirer intentionally or unintentionally omit any one of them, how can he be sure that he did not omit consulting the very one which contained the information on which the salvation of his soul depended: I say, if the consultation of all these be necessary, truly Wisdom's ways cannot be ways of pleasantness, nor her paths be the paths of peace.

17. This human contrivance has filled the christian world on the one hand with a pompous, florid, swollen diction, consisting principally of

words derived from foreign languages, and altogether unintelligible to the illiterate; and with metaphysical discussions equally above the comprehension of the unlearned christian; and on the other, with an ungrammatical, vulgar jargon, which can neither be understood nor endured, and which at the same time is crammed with absurdity and falsehood. Indeed, to this wretched invention we owe exclusively all the false and absurd doctrines, and all the unauthorized, unprofitable, and degrading institutions, and practices, which now disgrace and torment, and have, during many past generations, disgraced and tormented the professed followers of Jesus Christ, for in their production and dissemination the word of God has had no concern.

18. The use of this human device necessarily deprives the religious inquirer of all the inferior helps, such as context, connected phraseology, related passages, scope, &c. which the Holy Spirit has provided and exhibited to the attention of the reader of his message, to enable him to understand it with the greater certainty; and constantly exposes him to the danger of affixing that meaning to God's word, which fallible, erring, prejudiced men have given to it. Hence most readers of the Bible aim not at ascertaining what God's Spirit says to them, but what their expounders and teachers tell them, delighting not in the unerring declarations of the God of truth, but in the doubtful notions of uninspired, and, of course, unsafe men, about it.

19. A person who resorts to any of these human means of instruction for religious information, is in imminent—shall I say, in inevitable danger of having that unbiassed state, or, if I may so speak, that felt state of ignorance, completely destroyed, which is indispensably necessary to fit and dispose the reader's mind to receive the thoughts proposed by the Holy Spirit to his understanding, just as the Spirit has proposed them. Instead of coming to the Spirit's information, deeply sensible of, and deeply affected by, his ignorance; and, of course, eager to receive the Spirit's information, he comes under the persuasion that he already knows all that the Spirit has to communicate, and of course prepared to receive the Spirit's message as perfectly accordant with his previous conceptions of it, however much at variance with him it may be. PHILALETHES.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

---

*To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.*

DEAR SIR,

UPON looking into your November number of the *Christian Baptist*, for 1829, my attention was arrested by a letter addressed to you from King and Queen county, in this state. The letter, it seems, was occasioned by your explanation of Matthew xiii. 11, 13; Mark iv. 11, 12; Luke viii. 10: passages which present to my mind very different information from that usually ascribed to them.

1. What Christ says, he revealed to his pious and deeply interested

friends, and concealed from an irreligious and unconcerned multitude. by means of the parables contained in these chapters and others of a similar kind, is manifestly no part of the information which constitutes the gospel, and on the knowledge of which the salvation of sinners depends; but the fate or reception with which the information, called "the gospel," was destined to meet in the world; for to this reception alone the parables are confined.

2. The reasons which induced the Saviour to employ such a vehicle, as was calculated to give information concerning the fate of his new institution to his anxious friends, and not to his contemptuous enemies, are both obvious and satisfactory. In the fate of his new religious institution his friends alone were or could be interested. To them alone could the foreknowledge of its fate be either necessary or useful, and to them the foreknowledge of its fate was of the utmost importance. Enabling them to form accurate conceptions of its reception, it enabled them to correct any mistaken notions which they might have formed concerning the success of their Redeemer's new religion; and thus fortified them against the despondency, to which disappointment of the high expectations, which they, in common with the whole Jewish nation, entertained respecting the unparalleled prosperity of the Messiah's reign, would expose them; and at the same time give them such assurance of his ultimate triumph as would induce them to persevere in their efforts to promote it, even amidst the greatest discouragements. With the greatest propriety and wisdom, then, did Christ give to his friends information so necessary to their welfare, while he withheld it from an irreligious multitude, who could feel no interest in it, and to whom, if communicated, it could afford neither pleasure nor profit.

3. There was nothing peculiar in Christ's conduct on this occasion. It was his usual way to impart information to those who were interested in its reception, and withhold it from those who could derive no benefit from it, or might be disposed to make a bad use of it.

4. There exists not, I presume on the annals of divine revelation, a single instance of God's withholding one particle of that information which is necessary to the salvation of souls, from any member of the human family, which he gave to the rest. No, the benefit of that information, on which the salvation of souls depends, has ever been, like the benefit of solar light, offered and free to all. Even during the Mosaic institution, the heathen might, *if so disposed*, enjoy the fullest advantage of every divine communication. At all times whoever *would*, might come and take the water of life freely. And at this moment is not every particle of information that is offered in sacred writ to the warmest friend, to the most devoted disciple, offered to the bitterest enemy, to the most stubborn rebel, to the most impious and immoral of Adam's degenerate race? Where, then, is the alleged concealment, or veiling, to be found? In the human imagination alone. Indeed, so far is the gospel from being a secret, or containing secrets, that it glories in being expressly styled a revelation, a divine revelation. But how can that which is a revelation be secret, or

unrevealed? The thing is impossible. It is a contradiction in terms as well as in fact. Nay, Christ styles himself *the Light of the World*. But falsely is this title assumed, if he withheld from any individual of that perishing world any information necessary or conducive to his eternal happiness.

5. It is evident that the deplorable state of mind described in verse 12th of Mark and verse 13th of Matthew, neither did nor could arise from Christ's unexplained parables. It existed before they were uttered, and continued unaltered after their meaning was publicly announced. We must, therefore, look for its cause somewhere else, and we may readily trace it, in part, to that want of religious information which all human beings bring into the world with them; but principally to the *misinformation* (concerning the Messiah's person, office, character, and reign, and the means of salvation) by which the Jewish clergy had for many generations instilled their errors, prejudices, and bigotry, into the minds of an illiterate multitude, and misled them.

6. As the lamentable state of mind just mentioned could not be the result of Christ's parables, it is certain he could not have uttered them for the purpose of producing it. The use of the conjunction *ina*, therefore, in this place, must be, not to express Christ's intention to produce this state of mind, for he never conceived such a malevolent design, but to notify the completion of an ancient prediction, which seems to be introduced here to account for the unfavorable reception with which his new institution was about to meet from mankind, and for this unfavorable reception it does not account very clearly; for from the perverted state of the popular mind at this time did the unworthy treatment of his gospel entirely proceed.

7. Both Dr. Campbell and King James' Translators seem to have mistaken the relation which subsists between the *ta mysteria* of Matthew and Luke, and the *tomnsterion* of Mark, and the genitive *to mysterlon* which follows and limits them. It is evident the secrets denoted here, do not constitute a part of the new institution or gospel, as their translations import, but relate wholly to its fate or reception in the world, and the passage ought to have been translated, not secrets *of* the reign, but *concerning* the reign of God.

8. As to the question whether there be a moral boundary, or rather grade of depravity, at which, when a sinner arrives, he becomes irreclaimable by any of the means which God has provided for the liberation of mankind from their present state of guilt and depravity, I think the information contained in sacred writ is not sufficiently explicit to warrant a decision. True it is, that general declarations may be found that seem to indicate the existence of such a state; but they are so indefinite, that it is impossible, when we attempt to ascertain the boundary, to assure ourselves that we have found it. It is, moreover, true that the information offered in sacred writ is sufficient to enlighten the darkest mind, and the motives, which it presents, to affect and reform the most degenerate heart. But still it may be that error and prejudice may have taken such fast hold of the understand-

ing as to render it impenetrable by divine truth, and vicious propensities and habits, such inveterate possession of the heart, as to render it insensible to the most impressive, and dead to the most impulsive considerations contained in the book of God. At any rate, these general and alarming declarations answer a most important purpose. They warn sinners of their danger, and tend to arrest their progress in guilt and depravity, and deter them from continuing in a state of impenitency. PHILALETHES.

*From the Philadelphia Recorder.*

## MISTAKES DETECTED.

### THOUGHTS ON THE MILLENNIUM.

IN the preceding essay we made some observations upon the fact that professing christians generally, are not sufficiently interested in the subject of an approaching Millennium. The other class to whom we referred are the enemies of Christ, or impenitent sinners generally. At present this class embraces almost the whole family of man. Those who always prefer the popular side of a question feel no hesitation in remaining with the vast majority who oppose the reign of Christ. But they are to recollect that the state of parties will entirely change at a period no more distant than the commencement of the Millennium—that all who now compose *their* countless legions, must either quietly surrender and join the ranks of the Saviour's triumphing followers, or perish in vainly opposing an Almighty Conqueror. For *of the increase of his* (Christ's) *government and peace there shall be no end.* The very principles and worship which multitudes now oppose, or slight, will cover the whole earth. Every impenitent man belongs to a party that must desert from their present leader or be inevitably crushed. Their whole cause is the most utterly hopeless, that we can imagine. Nor is it the less so because they disbelieve such an assertion.

On this subject, however, there is one very great and very common mistake. Many persons admitting the existence of the two parties, and that they themselves now belong to the one which must be subdued, still seem to expect a translation in their own case, to the conquering ranks before the hour of trial, though utterly uncertain as to the means of its accomplishment. They are, perhaps, so utterly deceived as to imagine themselves waiting with *christian resignation* for a time when God will convert them, though in the mean time they constantly reject all the offers of mercy, and virtually set at nought all the threatenings of the Most High. Such persons ought to consider that it is in their own option whether they will enter the service of Christ or remain in their present allegiance Soldiers are not drafted against their own consent in this warfare, nor are they ever forced out of service on either side. It is equally true that our Saviour refuses none who offer to enlist under his banners; and to those who do not thus offer, he says, "*Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life.*" It is a case, then, where each person

voluntarily decides for himself, and can blame none but himself for an eternally wrong choice. God now sits upon a throne of mercy. The court is open for all who have business to transact previous to their final arraignment at the bar of justice. A Mediator is waiting to prefer all petitions and manage all causes for sinners, in this court of mercy. Pardons may be procured with the sign manual of the Judge—pardons that may be plead at the judgment bar with perfect safety. All, therefore, who expect to plead guilty at this last and final trial, are invited to procure the pardon as the only possible means of escaping the sentence to the second and endless death.

In reference to the progress of Christ's kingdom as a subject in which impenitent sinners are deeply concerned, the concluding paragraph of "the Natural History of Enthusiasm" seems very appropriate. The author, referring to the argument drawn from prophecy, for the final triumphs of the gospel, remarks thus:—"Yet in passing this subject, it may be suggested to those who, notwithstanding that they admit the truth of christianity, instantly deride genuine piety whenever it comes in their way, that though the apparent course of events seems to indicate a general improvement, such as would give time to oppugners to choose the wiser part, and to range themselves quietly in the train of the conquering religion, the terror of scriptural predictions holds out a different prospect, and gives great reason to suppose that the final triumph of the gospel is to be ushered in by some sudden and vindictive visitation, which shall arrest impiety in its full career, and deny forever to the then impenitent the option of making a better choice." C. S. A.

---

From the National [Philadelphia] Gazette.

### *Extract from the Remarks on the Character and Writings of Fenelon. By Rev.* William Ellery Channing.

IT is, we fear, an unquestionable fact, that religion, considered as an intellectual subject, is, in a great measure, left to a particular body of men, as a professional concern; and the fact is as much to be wondered at as deplored. It is wonderful that any mind, and especially a superior one, should not see in religion the highest object of thought. It is wonderful that the infinite God, the noblest theme of the universe, should be considered as a monopoly of professed theologians; that a subject so vast, awful, and exalting, as our relation to the Divinity, should be left to technical men, to be handled so much for sectarian purposes. Religion is the property and dearest interest of the human race. Every man has an equal concern in it. It should be rescued from all the factions which have seized upon it as their particular possession. Men of the highest intellect should feel, that, if there be a God, then his character and our relation to him throw all other subjects into obscurity, and that the intellect, if not consecrated to him, can never attain its true use, its full dimensions, and its proper happiness. Religion, if it be true, is central truth, and all knowledge, which is not gathered round it, and quickened and illuminated by it, is hardly worthy the name. To this great theme we would summon all orders of mind—the scholar, the statesman, the student of nature, and the observer of life. It is a subject to which every faculty and every acquisition may pay tribute, which may receive aids and lights from the accuracy of the logician, from the penetrating spirit of philosophy, from the intuitions of genius, from the researches of history, from the science of the mind, from physical science,

from every branch of criticism, and though last not least, from the spontaneous suggestions and the moral aspirations of pure but unlettered men.

It is a fact which shocks us, and which shows the degraded state of religion, that not a few superior minds look down upon it as a subject beneath their investigation. Though allied with all knowledge, and especially with that of human nature and human duty, it is regarded as a separate and an inferior study, particularly fitted to the gloom of a convent, and the seclustion of a minister. Religion is still confounded, in many gifted minds, with the jargon of monks and the subtleties and strifes of theologians. It is thought a mystery, which, far from coalescing, wars with our other knowledge. It is never ranked with the sciences which expand and adorn the mind. It is regarded as a method of escaping future ruin, not as a vivifying truth through which the intellect and heart are alike to be enlarged. Its bearing on the great objects of thought and the great interests of life is hardly suspected. This degradation of religion into a technical study, this disjunction of it from morals, from philosophy, from the various objects of liberal research, has done it infinite injury, has checked its progress, has perpetuated errors which gathered round it in times of barbarism and ignorance; has made it a mark for the sophistry and ridicule of the licentious, and has infused a lurking scepticism into many powerful understandings. Nor has religion suffered alone. The whole mind is darkened by the obscuration of the central light. Its reasonings and judgments become unstable through want of this foundation to rest upon. Religion is to the whole sphere of truth, what God is to the universe; and in dethroning it, or confining it to a narrow range, we commit very much such an injury on the soul, as the universe would suffer, were the Infinite Being to abandon it, or to contract his energy to a small province of his creation.

The injury done to literature by divorcing it from religion, is a topic worthy of separate discussion. Literature has thus lost power and permanent interest. It has become, in a great measure, superficial—an image of transient modes of thought and of arbitrary forms of life—not the organ and expression of immutable truth, and of deep workings of the soul. We beg not to be misunderstood. We have no desire that literature should confine itself wholly or chiefly to religious topics, and we hardly know a greater calamity which it could incur, than by degenerating into religious cant. Next to profaneness, we dread the affectation of piety and the mechanical repetition of sacred phraseology. We only lament that literature has been so generally an utterance of minds which have not lived, thought, and written under the light of a rational and sublime faith. Severed from this, it wants the principle of immortality. We do not speak lightly when we say, that all works of the intellect, which have not in some measure been quickened by the spirit of religion, are doomed to perish or to lose their power; and that genius is preparing for itself a sepulchre, when it disjoins itself from the Universal Mind. Religion is not always to remain in its present dark, depressed condition. Already there are signs of a brighter day. It begins to be viewed more generously. It is gradually attracting to itself superior understandings. It is rising from the low rank of a professional, technical study, and asserting its supremacy among the objects of the mind. A new era, we trust, is opening upon the world, and all literature will feel its power. In proportion as the true and sublime conception of God shall unfold itself in the soul, and shall become there a central sun, shedding its beams on all objects of thought, there will be a want of sympathy with all works which have not been quickened by this heavenly influence. It will be felt that the poet has known little of nature; that he has seen it only under clouds, if he has not seen it under this celestial light. It will be felt that man, the great subject of literature, when viewed in separation from his Maker and his end, can be as little understood and portrayed, as a plant torn from the soil in which it grew, and cut off from communication with the clouds and sun.

We are aware that objections will spring up to the doctrine, that all literature should be produced under the influence of religion. We shall be told, that in this way literature will lose all variety and spirit, that a monotonous and solemn

hue will spread itself over writing, and that a library will have the air of a tomb. We do not wonder at this fear. Religion has certainly been accustomed to speak in sepulchral tones, and to wear any aspect but a bright and glowing one. It has lost its free and various movement. But let us not ascribe to its nature what has befallen it from adverse circumstances. The truth is, that religion, justly viewed, surpasses all other principles in giving a free and manifold action to the mind. It recognizes in every faculty and sentiment the workmanship of God, and assigns a sphere of agency to each. It takes our whole nature under its guardianship, and with a parental love ministers to its inferior as well as higher gratifications. False religion mutilates the soul, sees evil in our innocent sensibilities, and rules with a tyrant's frown and rod. True religion is a mild and lawful sovereign, governing to protect, to give strength, to unfold all our inward resources. We believe, that under its influence, literature is to pass its present limits, and to put itself forth in original forms of composition. Religion is of all principles most fruitful, multiform, and unconfined. It is sympathy with that Being who seems to delight in diversifying the modes of his agency, and the products of his wisdom and power. It does not chain us to a few essential duties, or express itself in a few unchanging modes of writing. It has the liberality and munificence of nature, which not only produces the necessary root and grain, but pours forth fruits and flowers. It has the variety and bold contrasts of nature, which, at the foot of the awful mountain, scoops out the freshest, sweetest valleys, and embosoms in the wild, troubled ocean, islands, whose vernal airs, and loveliness, and teeming fruitfulness, almost breathes the joys of Paradise. Religion will accomplish for literature what it most needs; that is, will give it depth, at the same time that it heightens its grace and beauty. The union of these attributes is most to be desired. Our literature is lamentably superficial, and to some the beautiful and the superficial even seem to be naturally conjoined. Let not beauty be so wronged. It resides chiefly in profound thoughts and feelings. It overflows chiefly in the writings of poets, gifted with a sublime and piercing vision. A beautiful literature springs from the depth and fulness of intellectual and moral life, from an energy of thought and feeling, to which nothing, as we believe, ministers so largely as enlightened religion.

So far from monotonous solemnity overspreading literature in consequence of the all-pervading influence of religion, we believe that the sportive and comic forms of composition, instead of being abandoned, will only be refined and improved. We know that these are supposed to be frowned upon by piety; but they have their root in the constitution which God has given us, and ought not therefore to be indiscriminately condemned. The propensity to wit and laughter does, indeed, through excessive indulgence, often issue in a character of heartless levity, low mimicry, or unfeeling ridicule. It often seeks gratification in regions of impurity, throws a gaiety round vice, and sometimes even pours contempt on virtue. But though often and mournfully perverted, it is still a gift of God, and may and ought to minister, not only to innocent pleasure, but to the intellect and the heart. Man was made for relaxation as truly as for labor; and by a law of his nature, which has not received the attention it deserves, he finds, perhaps, no relaxation so restorative as that in which he reverts to his childhood, seems to forget his wisdom, leaves the imagination to exhilarate itself by sportive inventions, talks of amusing incongruities in conduct and events, smiles at the innocent eccentricities and odd mistakes of those whom he most esteems, indulges himself in arch allusions and kind-hearted satire, and transports himself into a world of ludicrous combinations. We have said that on these occasions the mind seems to put off its wisdom: but the truth is, that in a pure mind, wisdom retreats, if we may say so, to its centre, and there unseen, keeps guard over this transient folly, draws delicate lines which are never to be passed in the freest moments, and, like a judicious parent watching the sports of childhood, preserves a stainless innocence of soul in the very exuberance of gaiety. This combination of moral power with wit and humor, with comic conceptions and irrepressible laughter, this union of mirth

and virtue, belongs to an advanced stage of the character; and we believe, that in proportion to the diffusion of an enlightened religion, this action of the mind will increase, and will overflow in composition, which, joining innocence to sportiveness, will communicate unmixed delight. Religion is not at variance with occasional mirth. In the same character, the solemn thought and the sublime emotions of the improved christian, may be joined with the unanxious freedom, buoyancy, and gaiety of early years.

We will add but one more illustration of our views. We believe that the union of religion with genius will favor that species of composition to which it may seem at first to be least propitious. We refer to that department of literature which has for its object the delineation of the stronger and more terrible and guilty passions. Strange as it may appear, these gloomy and appalling features of our nature may be best comprehended and portrayed by the purest and noblest minds. The common idea is that overwhelming emotions, the more they are experienced, can the more effectually be described. We have one strong presumption against this doctrine. Tradition leads us to believe that Shakspeare, though he painted so faithfully and fearfully the storms of passion, was a calm and cheerful man. The passions are too engrossed by their objects to meditate on themselves; and none are more ignorant of their growth and subtle workings than their own victims. Nothing reveals to us the secrets of our own souls like religion; and in disclosing to us, in ourselves, the tendency of passion to absorb every energy, and to spread its hues over every thought, it gives us a key to all souls; for in all, human nature is essentially one, having the same spiritual elements, and the same grand features. No man, it is believed, understands the wild and irregular motions of the mind, like him in whom a principle of divine order has begun to establish peace. No man knows the horror of thick darkness which gathers over the slave's vehement passion, like him who is rising into the light and liberty of virtue. There is, indeed, a selfish shrewdness, which is thought to give a peculiar and deep insight into human nature. But the knowledge, of which it boasts, is partial, distorted, and vulgar, and wholly unfit for the purposes of literature. We value it little. We believe that no qualification avails so much to a knowledge of human nature in all its forms, in its good and evil manifestations, as that enlightened, celestial charity, which religion alone inspires; for this establishes sympathies between us and all men, and thus makes them intelligible to us. A man, imbued with this spirit, alone contemplates vice as it really exists, and as it ought always to be described. In the most depraved fellow-beings he sees partakers of his own nature. Amidst the terrible ravages of the passions, he sees conscience, though prostrate, not destroyed nor wholly powerless. He sees the proofs of an unextinguished moral life, in inward struggles, in occasional relentings, in sighings for lost innocence, in reviving throbs of early affections, in the sophistry by which the guilty mind would become reconciled to itself, in remorse, in anxious forebodings, in despair, perhaps in studied recklessness and cherished self-forgetfulness. These conflicts between the passions and the moral nature, are the most interesting subjects in the branch of literature to which we refer, and we believe that to portray them with truth and power, the man of genius can find in nothing such effectual aid, as in the developement of the moral and religious principles in his own breast.

We have given but a superficial view of a great subject. The connexion of religion with intellect and literature is yet to be pointed out. We conclude by expressing our conviction that the human mind will become more various, piercing, and all-comprehending, more capable of understanding and expressing the solemn and the sportive, the terrible and the beautiful, the profound and the tender, in proportion as it is illuminated and penetrated by the true knowledge of God. Genius, intellect, imagination, taste, and sensibility, must all be baptized into religion, or they will never know, and can never make known their real glory and important power.

## PROPHECIES—*No. II.*

THE Jews will, in their unconverted state, actually and literally return to their own land before Jesus Christ appears to destroy the *Man of Sin* by the glory or power of his coming. So reads the first of the four propositions submitted in our last; to the proof of which we now advance, with this single preliminary, that we shall, in due order, show, 1st. *That the Jews will return.* 2d. *That they will return in an unconverted state.*

1st. The Jews will actually and literally return to their own land. To feel the full force of the many things which we have got to say in support of this part of our proposition, the reader must indulge us with a hearing, while we state to him, from Scripture, the dismemberment of the Jewish nation at the accession of Rehoboam to the throne of his father Solomon, about the year of the world 3000. On this subject we are informed (1 Kings, xi. 29.) that Jeroboam, a servant to Solomon and a man of valor, rebelled against the King: "And it came to pass at that time, when Jeroboam went out of Jerusalem, that the Prophet Ahijah the Shilonite met him on the way; and he had clad himself with a new garment: and they two were alone in the field. And Ahijah caught the new garment that was on him, and rent it in twelve pieces; and he said to Jeroboam take thee ten pieces, for thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give thee ten tribes; but he shall have one tribe for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel." All this came to pass in the days of Rehoboam; for Jeroboam having returned from Egypt, whither he had been driven by Solomon, "it came to pass when all Israel heard that Jeroboam was come again, that they sent and called him unto the congregation, and made him King over all Israel. There was none that followed the house of David but the tribe of Judah." 1 Kings, xii. 20. So Jeroboam reigned at Shechem, in Mount Ephraim, over the ten tribes, and Rehoboam at Jerusalem over Judah and Benjamin. "And there was war between Jeroboam and Rehoboam all the days of his life." xv. 6.

Jeroboam, however, proved himself wholly unworthy of the rank to which the Most High exalted him; and his reign, with all that followed, was distinguished for the most unheard-of profligacy and idolatry, until the elevation of Hoshea, son of Elah, when God sent against the ten tribes Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, who took their capital, Samaria, "and carried away to Assyria *all* Israel, and placed them in (the towns of) Halah and Habor by the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes;" from whence, as is allowed on all hands, they never returned into their own land. But that they will *yet* return we shall now show by many distinct prophecies; and first we shall begin with Hoshea, who predicted the captivity of the ten tribes long before it occurred, as he has also foretold their restoration to the land of their fathers in the latter days. iii. 4. "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince

and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without a teraphim. Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God and David their king, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days."

Jeremiah who lived after the dispersion of the ten tribes, which were usually styled "Israel," predicts their return thus: (ch. iii. 12.) "Go and proclaim these words towards the North, and say, Return, thou backsliding Israel, saith the Lord, and I will not cause my anger to fall upon you; for I am merciful, saith the Lord, and will not keep anger for ever; only acknowledge thine iniquity that thou hast transgressed against the Lord thy God, and hast scattered thy ways to the strangers under every green tree; and you have not obeyed my voice, saith the Lord. Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord, for I am married unto you; and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion. And I will give you pastors according to my heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding. And it shall come to pass, when you be multiplied and increased in the land, in those days, saith the Lord, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the Lord: neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall that be done any more. At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem; neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart. In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers." Chap. xvi. 14. "Therefore, behold the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth that brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The Lord liveth that brought up the children of Israel out of the land of the north, and *from all lands* whither he had driven them; and I will bring them again into their land which I gave unto their fathers!" [See also 23d, 30th, 31st, 32d, and 33d chapters of the same prophecies.]

The manner of their return is made known to us by Hoshea: "Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land; for great shall be the day of Jezreel." [See also chapters 2d, 3d, and 13th of this Prophet.] The Lord says by Ezekiel, "Behold I, even I will both search my sheep and seek them out." ch. xxxiv. 11. [See also chapters 11, 16, 20, 29, 36, and 37, where the unity of the two houses of Judah and Israel is predicted as follows:] "And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all, and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all." But it may be asked, Where are they to be found, for men have searched the most remarkable portions of the earth for them in vain? Jeremiah relieves us from all difficulty here; for although hid from human sight, they are not beyond the reach of

God's eye. "For," says he, "mine eyes are upon all their ways; they are not hid from my sight, neither is their iniquities hid from mine eyes." Chap. xvi. verse 16. "Behold I will send for many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them; and after will I send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks." From this last expression it is possible the ten tribes are now in some of the high and yet unexplored table lands of central and northern Asia, or they may be the American Indians; at all events, there are many portions of this globe the geography of which is but inadequately understood. Let Infidelity look to this, and be afraid; let Scepticism and Atheism hide their diminished heads when the Lord does this great miracle before men. Who but God could have kept a nation from coming to an end after such a prostration of every thing national? But it is written by the Eternal, "Fear not, O my servant Jacob! saith the Lord; neither be dismayed, O Israel! for, lo! I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and be in rest, and be quiet, and none shall make him afraid." Where are the Assyrians, the ancient Greeks, the Romans, the Carthagenians, the Sidonians? They perished with the loss of their nationality; but of the Jews it is said, and it has been verified, "Though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee." Talk not about their long protracted dispersion. With the Eternal *one day is as a thousand, and a thousand years as one day.* For "thus saith the Lord who giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and stars for a light by night, who divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; the Lord of Hosts is his name: If these ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation before me for ever. Thus saith the Lord, If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord." ch. xxxi. 35. The Most High will yet terribly convulse the unbelieving world, and those who presumptuously in christendom have cast off the yoke of Messiah, and have denied God; yea, and "all the heathen shall know that the house of Israel went into captivity for their iniquity, because they trespassed against me; therefore hid I my face from them, and gave them into the hands of their enemies." Ezek. xxxix. 23. Many grand things shall occur when God shall have done this, as will be shown in due time; but we must not anticipate. However, take this single bunch of grapes, O reader! as an antepast of the feast of fat things to come—of wines on the lees—of wines on the lees well refined. "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come people and the inhabitants of many cities; and the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, "Let us go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord of Hosts; I will go also. Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord. Thus saith the Lord

of Hosts, In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." Zech. viii. 20. [See also chapters 1st, 2d, 4th, 8th, 9th, 12th, 13th, and 14th of the same prophecy.] Malachi, Zechariah, and Haggai prophesied after the two tribes had returned from Babylon, and the Apostle Paul quotes the last to prove that one, and only one more great revolution shall take place in favor of the true religion: "Yet once more I shake not only the earth, but also heaven." So much for the first part of our proposition, viz. *that the Jews will actually and literally return to their own land*; the proof of which we close by a single quotation from Amos, who, it is supposed, was contemporary with Hoshea, and who, after predicting their dispersion and their preservation in that state, ends his prophecy with these words, "I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel, and they shall build the waste cities and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit thereof; and I will plant them upon their own land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of the land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God."

The second part of our proposition is, that *they shall return to their own land in an unconverted state.* It was noticed in the public journals some time ago that the celebrated *Irving* and sundry others of the London preachers had come out on this side, and that the public declaration of their sentiments had taken very sensible effect on the friends of the London Missionary Society for converting the Jews; many, if not all of the Dukes, Marquises, Earls, Lords, Viscounts, Esquires, and Gentlemen of the Realm, having withdrawn their subscriptions. Of the Prophets who have spoken of the restoration of the Temple service, Ezekiel is the one who has been most minute; for he describes particularly the form and size of the Temple, the duties of the Priesthood; the daily, weekly, and annual services; the Prince's offering, with the feasts, fasts, tithing, &c. &c. and terminates his prophecy by a detailed account of the new and beautiful manner in which the land of Canaan is to be laid out in parallel strips, running from the Mediterranean sea back to the river Jordan. The Jews never have been located in their land in the manner described by this Prophet. [See chapters 45th, 47th, and 48th.] Ezekiel says that the name of their city from that day shall be "*the Lord is there*;" but how, indeed, should any one hope to see the Jews converted before their return to Judea, when even now we know not where the mass of them exists; the tribes of Judah and Benjamin are, indeed, found in all the trading ports of Europe, Asia, and America; but instead of looking towards the christian religion with any favor, they abhor it and all its professors, and are even now many of them setting their faces towards Jerusalem and the land of their fathers. The following notice of this has run the rounds of the English and American journals.

"A letter from Mr. *Wolff*, the celebrated missionary to the Jews, dated *Cyprus, July* 15, states that when he was at Jaffa last summer,

about one hundred Jews, chiefly old men and women, arrived at that place, from Constantinople, on their way to Jerusalem, where they were going to remain until death." A gentleman of equal respectability, writing from Constantinople more recently, says, that he "heard of a great number of ships being hired by the Jews to convey them to Jerusalem. He found they were going in expectation of the near coming of their Messiah. He adds that *thousands of families* were preparing to embark from all quarters." Another letter from the south of Europe, dated last November, confirms these statements, and adds that "their expectations of the Messiah is the reason openly given;" at all events, it is certain that great numbers have actually embarked, whatever may be the motive that has influenced them.

That they will remain unconverted until the Saviour comes to open their eyes, is noticed by the Apostle, Rom. xi. 25. "For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, of this mystery, lest you should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness in part has happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written, "There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." It would appear from this that Jesus personally is to turn away ungodliness from the Jewish nation. "*This* is my covenant with them when I shall take away their sins."

These are a few of the proofs which go to sustain our first proposition. When the second comes upon the carpet, they will be more felt and better understood by the reader, to whom this development may be altogether new. DANIEL.

## MAHONING ASSOCIATION.

THIS Association held its last meeting in Austintown, Trumbull County, Ohio. Such has been the efficiency of the gospel in the district of country over which the churches of this Association are spread, that it has caused to wither almost every sectarianism within and without the congregation composing it. The sects cannot stand before the ancient gospel where fully preached and practised. Those preachers who oppose the ancient gospel in the vicinities, do not only lose their adherents, but they lose the power of converting men to their system. Hence, a visible decline in the power, as well as in the admirers of sectarianism, every where appears in the district of country where the reformation and forgiveness of sins are proclaimed. To convert men to God, the sectaries have no power when this gospel is proclaimed. In a war between sects, that sect which happens to take with the people, will be most successful. But when the sects array themselves against "the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins," they are found like Dagon with broken arms and limbs lying before the covenant of the Lord.

Such a meeting was not witnessed in the memory of any present, as was the late meeting of churches in Austintown. The first day, Friday, was spent in declaring the wonders which God had wrought

in various portions of the Western Reserve by the restoration of the ancient gospel. Songs of praise and tears of joy mingled with these reports, translated us nigher the regions of bliss than we had ever before approached. The next day, finding no business to transact, no queries to answer, nothing to do but "to love, and wonder, and adore," it was *unanimously* agreed that the Mahoning Association as "an advisory council," as "an ecclesiastical tribunal", exercising any supervision or jurisdiction over particular congregations, should never meet again. This Association came to its end as tranquilly as ever did a good old man whose attenuated thread of life, worn to a hair's breadth, dropped asunder by its own imbecility

"*Night dews fall not more gently to the ground,*
*Nor weary worn out winds expire more soft,*"

than did this Association give up the ghost.

The whole meeting was engaged for the most part in addresses from the holy scriptures, in exhortations, prayers, praises, and conversions. More than thirty persons were immersed for the remission of sins upon the ground, and after the meeting several more; making, I think, in all forty-three.

From the intelligence received from all parts of the Association, it appeared that within its bounds, and by the laborers acting under its auspices, during the last year about *one thousand persons* have been immersed for the remission of sins. This has been about the annual average of conversions for the last three years.

After the death and burial of "the Association," it was agreed that all the churches should meet on the Friday preceding the last Lord's day in August next in New Lisbon, Columbiana county, for worship, and to report the progress of the gospel in their respective vicinities. This meeting is not made a stated meeting, but it will be optional with the brethren then and there assembled, whether, when, and where, to have another general meeting of the congregations in that district of country.

REFLECTIONS.

About ten public speakers have been partially employed in the conversions of the last year. But of these not one has been constantly in the field. More than half the number are farmers I myself labor occasionally in the Word, and most, if not all, the brethren engaged in this work, either in whole or in part, labor with their own hands for their own support. Besides the assistance rendered by some congregations to their own overseers, the actual amount of contributions to those who rode through the Association, did not much exceed *five hundred* dollars.

These facts, a part of the statistics of only one district where the ancient gospel is proclaimed, will more fully corroborate the remarks in page 349 on the inefficiency of Presbyterianism. It will appear that the conversion of one soul to Presbyterianism, costs two hundred times as much as the conversion of one soul to the ancient faith and religion. The world must decide the genuineness of the conversion in favor of one or the other of the converts. This their lives must

prove. But by looking back into the statistics of the Presbyterian Church, it will appear that the annual expense of that institution, besides the foundation of its schools and colleges, and averaging the annuity of its ministers at 500 dollars each, amounts to more than 1,200,000 per annum, which makes each convert cost that population more than one hundred dollars. In arguing thus, we argue with them on their own principles. We reason with their own logic. Can that institution be of God?

The efficiency is in the sword of the Spirit. When used according to the tactics of the Captain of Salvation, it is mighty to subdue the King's enemies. This, and not philosophy and humanisms, is what converts the soul. The people are astonished at its efficiency. It not only converts enemies into friends, but teaches them to live holily and unblameably as sons of God. It proves itself to be God's instrument, not merely by its converting power, but by its power to form the life anew. Philosophy, whether Calvinian or Arminian, is as feeble in its sanctifying, as in its converting power. The impetus which it brings is too weak to drive a man from the dominion of the flesh. But the argument of remission, immediate, full, and free, through faith in Jesus' blood, and immersion into his name; the love of God thus made sensible, tangible, and accessible to the penitent, purifies and elevates the affections of men above the allurements of time and sense. Hence, it is that the weapons which God puts into our hands, if rightly used, cannot fail of converting men to God, and of reforming their lives.

"These weapons of the holy war,
Of what almighty force they are
To make our stubborn passions bow,
And lay the proudest rebel low!
The Greeks, the Jews, the learn'd, and rude,
Are by these heavenly arms subdued;
While S tan rages at the loss,
And hates the doctrine of the Cross.

EDITOR.

## ASSOCIATIONS, PROSCRIPTIONS, AND ANATHEMAS.

TO inscribe upon these pages the reports, recently received from the most respectable sources, concerning the sayings and doings of those opposed to a restoration of the ancient gospel and order of society, would be to fill up two or three numbers with details the most dishonorable to religion, morals, and even political courtesy, which this century has produced. Materials for a dozen of essays are now on hand, the most appropriate head to which would be, *The History of Sin in the 19th Century.* Men, in whose profession of christianity we once had confidence, have proved to every spectator that either they never knew the gospel of peace, or, having known it, have apostatized from its dominions. They have formally sacrificed all chris-

tian purity and virtue on the altar of their own sectarian ambition; and, as if this were not enough, have let loose their worst passions, like furies, upon those who have proclaimed reformation, and called upon the professed disciples of Christ to practise the things commanded by the Royal Chief of the Christian Army.

Those who have visited some of the Regular Baptist Associations in the South and West, have taken up their parable and said, with Solomon the King, "I saw the place of judgment, but wickedness was there; and the place of righteousness, but iniquity was there." Our opponents, as if they feared we had not arguments enough to plead for reform, to show to the most astute minds that there was need for it, determined to fill our mouths with arguments which cannot fail to carry conviction to every one susceptible of feeling the force of an argument. We have only now to say, Look at the master spirits of Franklin, Elkhorn, Beaver, and Grand River. Those of the two latter, at least some of the most noisy against reform, are published to the world not only as opposers of reform in others, but as grossly immoral men. Some of them, after the most violent efforts against reform, became too rankly immoral for even the churches which sustained them in crying out heresy against us. A *gentleman* (as courtesy says we ought to call him) who said that *if he thought a Christian Baptist* (alluding to a number of that periodical) *was in the bounds of his churches, he would ride all night to destroy it*, figured two or three years ago on the stage of the Grand River Association in denouncing reform, is now, I am told, published in a New York religious paper as excommunicated because of immorality! Think how glaring must be the proofs which excluded a man who is said to have been at the head, or among the heads, of the Baptist denomination in New York! Others who were field marshals under him on that day in the war for orthodoxy, have fallen into similar fates.

Kentucky has never seen such a spectacle as this year has presented to her. All law, religious, political, and ecclesiastical, has been declared void. In what jeopardy are all rights and immunities, religious and political, in any community which accounts all restraints constitutional, or subordinate, to be dispensed with when one part of the community, whether a majority or a minority, pleases to say, *Avaunt, all restraints!*

A certain Doctor opened the campaign. He and his man *Dillard* have performed the grand visitation, tour, or *tournament*, as the reader may please to call it. Finding no *precedent* for the course he supposed "the church in danger" called for, he determined to make a precedent for the benefit of all the Associations. This did the *pro re nata* meeting and the 39 *Articles* of Franklin furnish. But fearing the example would not be sufficient, the Doctor and his minister rode the circuit, and told the Associations to look at Franklin. He found a few kindred spirits, and they acted their part in the great *drama* as good performers.

I will not now go into details. Kentucky has seen of what manner of spirit the advocates for the present order of things, and "sound

doctrine," are. May she profit from the example! And if any will not hearken to our arguments for reform, I hope they will listen to the voice of the sayings and doings of the leaders of the opposition. Let them look to Elkhorn, to South District, and to Franklin, for the spirit and the manners, the religion and morals, of the enemies of the ancient gospel. If what has been said and done by the enemies of reform, will not open the eyes of all impartial spectators, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.

The advocates of reform will do great injustice to the cause which they plead, if they should blush at—nay, if they should not rejoice in reproaches and persecutions from such men. I trust they will do in Kentucky what they have done in other parts—proclaim the gospel, and pray for the conversion of their enemies. In this way all reproaches and persecutions have turned out for the furtherance of the gospel. The heavenly logic and rhetoric is this: "When reviled, we bless; when persecuted, we bear; when defamed, we beseech."

The friends of the gospel, and of seeing it restored in its ancient simplicity, have nothing to fear from the number or power of its enemies. If they were as cunning, as malicious, and as puissant as Satan, what are they when allied against the Lord of hosts and the panoply of a christian army? The Lord of Sabaoth will be on the side of his own gospel, and they who are with him "are called, and chosen, and faithful."

The cause we plead is as sure of victory as God reigns. Of this we are as confident as of the mission of the Messiah. No matter who lives or dies, who recants, apostatizes, or falls away, the cause of the ancient gospel is invincible. God has said, "Jesus shall reign until all things are subdued under him;" and the Saviour says, "Upon this rock my family shall stand, and the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against it."

The victories gained in Franklin, Elkhorn, Grand River, and elsewhere, are most decisive in its favor. Not a single opponent dared to defend his system by argument, nor meet an advocate of *restoration*, upon the Bible. Their only allies are church councils, creeds, and majorities. Their only arguments are, 'Thus saith the tradition of the elders;' 'thus say our old Preachers;' 'and surely they cannot be mistaken.' And the all-conclusive and irrefragable appeal is, 'This corresponds with our experience.' There is not a writer nor a speaker on the continent, in favor of the present traditions, who can make a better defence than the Elkhorn, Franklin, and Grand River Associations. Like a good lady who proved her conversion and her views by alleging that *Jeremiah Vardeman* was her spiritual father, that so he taught and so she believed; while brother Vardeman proved his doctrine to be true by an appeal to the experience of the lady: so the people prove their doctrine to be true by appealing to the teachers, and the teachers prove their doctrine to be true by appealing to the people!

EDITOR.

## ON PUBLIC SPEAKERS.

*"I command every one not to think more highly of himself than he ought to think"*

WHEN one reads the Holy Scriptures with reference to the lives of the original witnesses of christianity, he is confounded with the full measure of their endurance; and is ready to ask what mighty influence sustained them in the midst of such unheard of afflictions, necessities, distresses, stripes, imprisonments, labors, watchings, fastings. Stephen was stoned to death—James was slain with the sword. They were imprisoned, maltreated, banished, while the Captain of the army of the faith was slain and hanged upon a tree. The fact is that the twelve Apostles felt—nay, believed—nay, knew that they were God's children, and their lives the media through which was to be discovered the nature and character of that pure and noble spirit of which they were made partakers when they were adopted into the Eternal's family.

The Apostles seem greatly to have delighted in this adoption. "Behold," says John, "what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us, that we should be called sons of God." The consequences, says he, of such a favor, are to us incomprehensible. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." I have frequently thought that the grand reason why the Apostles arose up, and did, and suffered so much, was, that they lived in the full conviction of this adoption; enjoying the liberties, immunities, privileges, and honors of it withal. We know that we are of God, says John, because he has given to us of his Spirit. They felt they were pardoned, justified, sanctified, redeemed, reconciled, bought, saved, ennobled, made children of a Great King, princes of the family royal of heaven, and inmates of the palace of God. *Their* faith, therefore, overcome the world; but the world has overcome *the* faith of our instructers. They have neither the Spirit, nor the renown of the ancients; but, like the dubious prisoner waiting for a reprieve, are divided between hope and fear, incapable of all noble resolve. Awake, ye sons of God! ye princes of the Most High, awake! Your Royal Lord has been betrayed—his cause has been trampled under foot—his witnesses have been cast out as dirt upon the streets—their blood has fattened every soil—all the shades of all the fathers bid you arise! Shall they pass in review before us—shall they beckon us from our earthy attachments, and we refuse to follow them! Let us go forth brethren with our life in one hand, and our Bible in the other, resolved through Christ to redeem his cause, or die! Let us go forth to him who suffered without the camp, bearing our cross.

---

A is certainly eloquent, but his style is too humanized to win the approbation of those who, careless of the "words of men's wisdom," prefer having the things of the Spirit spoken in words dictated by the Spirit. There is this error, also, in the addresses of A:—He begins in scripture, and too frequently ends with the fathers and philosophy.

Now A should know that the picture will always be in good keeping so long as the child sports himself with his marbles; but should he affect the same thing with the planets, or even with pieces of rock larger than his own head, he would not fail to become ridiculous, if not dangerous, both to himself and others.

B is not aware what nature has done to impede his popularity as a public speaker. He has never inquired whether she have given him the power of attaching an audience; and although the public have repeatedly determined this for him in the negative, still he is convinced and willing to hope the best.

C is somewhat of an orator; but tedious and monotonous. He possesses none of that creative faculty which is necessary to astonish; and none of those turns for imagery and illustration, which are all powerful to delight and instruct. Upon the whole, C's addresses will be interesting, if they are brief. Happy is that man who ceases to speak when he has nothing to say. A young Greek being asked why he did not reply, answered, What was to the point I *could* not say; and what was not to the point I *would* not say.

D. Nature has done a very great deal for D, and yet his oratory is that of the head rather than the heart. If his speeches are not powerful, they are at least pointed, and sometimes various and impressive—garnished all over with festoons of scripture, culled with discretion from Genesis to Revelation. He does not attach so soon as some speakers; but when he ceases to reason, and begins to feel, all the brethren rejoice. His person is diminutive, and his manners piquant; but he wraps himself up in the bosom of his brethren, and on the wings of love and music, soars aloft to heaven and his Saviour, leaving all the world behind. A bundle of divinity and talent. When he has finished, we think of the little man by whom God broke down the religion of Greece and Rome, hurling the idols from the glory they had usurped, and laying their temples in ruins along the ground. If, however, D imagine that nature has made him the wonder and delight of the age, rather than an intelligent and zealous brother in the christian church, he is mistaken. His circumscribed experience, his limited education, the sphere in which he has hitherto moved, with other circumstances, conspire alike to forbid him a higher rank. This, indeed, is enough. "High is the rank we now possess."

E. The wheels of E's carriage move slow at first, not because they need grease, but because the grease needs to be warmed; as E advances, however, he raises himself on high, bearing along with him, at a gentle rate, all his audience, until he brings them to the place where he wants to alight, when all confess that if the road has been long, it has also been level and free from stones. The recovery of the ancient gospel has made both a new and a good preacher out of E; and no body is more successful, nor more esteemed for christian virtues than he. With both genteel manners, and a gentlemanly exterior in his favor, what may not E effect, when, with a gospel in his hand, which he loves, and admires, and feels, he goes forth to the conversion of the nations. If brother E's propositions were

fewer, his proofs more pointed, his illustrations more showy, and his confutations direct; his speeches would, if not faultless, at least be mostly pleasing, and always profitable.

F. The head is the ornament and oracle of man. F's head is round, and, compared with his person, small; his eyes full, orbicular, and lively; his forehead receding, round, and mantled by a scanty tuft of raven black hair, rushing into petit ringlets; his face round, full, and tinted with a blush of red—nose rather short, and chin small and dimpled; his neck short, and his whole superior conformation apoplectic. F's person is of the middle size, and corpulent. F, whose *tout ensemble*, is wise and humorous—is naturally an orator, and a man of feeling, and if his education had been as liberal as his mind is piercing and expansive, he must have stood in the first rank of public speakers. When he stammers upon a subject with which he is acquainted, (for like most men of talent he has rather too much indolence, or too much confidence in himself to study) he never fails to interest and instruct. It is then he feels, and it is, too, then his audience feel, and are carried at his will through all the variety of emotion—from the solemn to the sympathetic, and, thence, again, to absolute joy—joy unspeakable and full of glory. F's oratory is naturally that of the head and heart, and nothing is necessary to perfect it but more learning, order, care, and application to study. F has a fine musical voice, and good action; but in some of his speeches, there is more sound than sense; this is his own fault. But F loves his blessed Redeemer, which is better than all; and if they persevere, thousands will love to bless God in Christ Jesus for his labors in preaching and teaching the ancient gospel.

G. When G moves the harp of Israel, it is to the high songs of creation, redemption, and glory! When his full spirit mingles itself with the theme of nature, we think of the angels who saw the world awake, and "shouted o'er the rising ball." If temporal and spiritual deliverances inform his lyre, we hear the song of Moses and the Lamb. G is a holy man, and feels the deepest interest in the salvation of the human soul; he attaches in a moment, and, in the midst of the great congregation, goeth forth like a lamp that burneth. When he casteth abroad the terrors of the Lord, the tallest trees of wickedness are scathed. When he beateth up the thickets of sin, sinners flee away or die; and, in his prayers, he maketh heaven and earth to mingle into one. Inclining to the fleshy, with a deep and sonorous voice, his person tall, and his countenance impressive, he taketh his stand upon Mount Calvary, and there he reasoneth not; (and it is not necessary) but there his own soul, yea, and all souls, in groans that cannot be uttered, are poured forth, sanctified by all tears and contrition. Now it is that sinners come forth from their hiding places, and cry to be saved. G cannot reason, but his thoughts, which always look as if they were instinctive, are, at once, glowing and profound. He is rather a moral than an intellectual being, and fills the heart rather than enlightens the head.

PHILIP.

## CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE—*No. III.*

SIMILAR causes produce similar effects. The gospel preached by the Apostles, and believed by their hearers, produced fruits in the hearts, and fruits in the lives of men, differing far from the fruits of any system, religious or moral, ever promulged among men. The same gospel, believed, will produce the same fruits, as certainly as any system now on earth, taught or believed, produces its own effects. The system and the fruits are as inseparable as life and motion. Methodism, Quakerism, and Presbyterianism, produce as different fruits, in those who cordially embrace these systems, and are imbued with them, as chesnut, hickory, and oak. The disciples of each system are as like one another as the acorns which grow on one tree; or as the coins which are issued from the same mint. This is said with respect to the genuine and unfeigned creatures of these systems. They are not all Israel who are of Israel, neither are they all Methodists who are of Methodism.

I speak not of the outward man only, but of the effects of the system. 'Tis not the Methodistic habit, nor the Quaker's style, nor the Presbyterian modes and forms, but the spirit and soul of these systems in the heart, or within men. For as the kingdom of heaven, or rather the reign of heaven, is in men; so is the reign of Methodism, Quakerism, and Presbyterianism in men. The family likeness is not only in the persons, but in the dispositions of the children. Differing in what constitutes personal identity, they harmonize in the family characteristics. They argue falsely who approbate their experience; because of its resemblance to those of the same school. They must first prove the system to be divine, before the similarity of their feelings, sentiments, or experiences, can be urged as consolatory to themselves, or demonstrative to others. How absurd and deceptious, then, is the assurance which a person feels that he is a christian, because his experience accords with the experience of a hundred persons who are, with him, the creatures of one system, the pupils of the same school, and children of the same religious family.

If men, we have said, believed the same gospel, sincerely and cordially believed it, which the first converts believed, they would, under the same circumstances, experience and exhibit the same influences and results. This proposition, we presume, needs no proof. Many do not believe the same gospel, but another gospel; and, consequently, their experience varies from the ancient experiences, as much as the modern gospels vary from the ancient gospel. But that the true christian may be discovered from the counterfeit, and that all who wish to try their experience, and prove it by a safe standard, may be directed to safe, infallible criteria, I proceed to offer some of the items of christian experience, without which no person can have any rational pretences to be a christian.

All true christians, as always did all true saints, tremble at the Word of God. Thus says the Lord—"To this man will I look, even to him who is of an humble and contrite spirit, and *trembles* at my

Word." No evidence of genuine conversion to God is more insisted on in all the Book of God—none more unequivocal, none more difficult to counterfeit than this. Men may be more easily deceived in their zeal, in their love, in their hopes, in their joys, or in the causes and objects of them, than in this. The object is one in which there can be no mistake. Veneration for the Word of God, and trembling regard for it, is a principle of action so discoverable in its operations, so peculiar in its developements, so distinguishable in contrast from every other principle, that the most deliberate neglect, to what passes in the mind, is necessary to make deception possible.

Love for the Word of God, reverence for it, impelled the Apostles to exclaim, in an early part of their christian life, "Lord to whom shall we go, but to thee: for thou hast the words of eternal life?" When the Lord described the citizens of his kingdom in his good confession before Pilate, he chose to designate them by this character—"Every one who is of the truth, (my subject) hearkens to my voice." And when John wrote his 1st Epistle, full of the christian characteristics, he relates this, "We Apostles are of God; he that is of God hearkens to us." To hearken, in the Hebrew idiom, is to reverence, so as to obey.

To the spiritual taste of all saints, the following words accord:—"The Law, or Word, of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul. The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart. The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. More to be desired is the Word of the Lord than gold; yea, than much fine gold; sweeter, also, than honey and the honey-comb. Happy the man who meditates thereon day and night!"

Jesus said. "He that is of God heareth God's words." They who hear not God's words, are not of God. "My sheep hear my voice." John makes this the best test of the Spirit of Truth, and the spirit of error. Hence, he adds, "By this we know the Spirit of Truth, and the spirit of error." By what? By this:—"He that is of God hears us: he that is not of God hears us not." Now, from these premises, may we not conclude, that a veneration for, a delight in, and submission to, the Word of God, is an infallible test of christian character, an essential attribute of christian experience?

By this test, let those who tell their experience, try themselves. "O! how I love thy testimonies! they are my study all the day—As the infant longs for its mother's breast, so does my soul desire the unadulterated milk of the Word: yea, as the thirsty hart pants for the cooling streams, so longs my soul for the Word of the Lord." Is not this the language of your heart, disciple of the Lord? If so, assuredly the holy writings are your counsellors—on them you ponder with delight—to them you look for direction, and a "*thus says the Lord*" decides every doubt.

The converts made by momentary excitement—made by false gospels—made by mere appeals to the passions, are remarkable for

nothing so much as their disregard for the sacred writings, and their frequent apostacies. While those who intelligently enlist under the banners of the great Captain of Salvation, and in the belief of the ancient gospel, submit to the righteousness of God, receive the remission of their sins, and vow allegiance to the Lord, are remarkable for their veneration for the Oracle, and love to the testimony of God. You will find them addicted to the constant reading of the sacred writings, and extremely scrupulous upon what authority they lend their ear, or their assent to any proposition, affecting their christian faith or practice.

Never could I form a favorable opinion of any man professing christianity, whether teacher or taught, who manifested the least apathy or indifference on any question involving the authority upon which he believed, or observed any religious institution. When the question is, How will this pass with the multitude? How will the elders relish this? when these arguments avail to the support of any doctrine or practice, then I am ready to say with Abraham on another occasion, and with more certainty too—"Surely the fear of God is not in this place." Let God be true, though it should prove every man a liar. The purity and chastity of every woman, are to be suspected who appears more sedulous to please every gentleman than her husband. And he that studies to please men more than God, of all other men, gives the least evidence of a conscience pure, and of a religious veneration for the Word of Eternal Life.

As I have never found a christian strongly marked with the attributes of christian character, careless about, or a negligent reader of, the living and efficacious oracles; so I have never found a christian like Nathaniel of unquestionable character, and guileless pretensions, who did not spend much time in reading and admiring the life-giving Word. And if every unfeigned christian under heaven were to tell his christian experience, and to give utterance full, and express to the feelings of his heart, he would say;—"O how I love thy Word! it is my study all the day. It is more precious to me than rubies—it is sweeter to my soul than honey, and the honey-comb."

EDITOR.

## NEWS FROM KENTUCKY.

MANY communications, such as the following, have been received at this office. This was received since writing the "*Request*," page 429; and, coming up so exactly to the information we require, I publish it. We cannot promise to publish the letters in full, but from them to extract such information as they may contain. While we have so much opposition to contend with, we are daily comforted with the many animating communications received from all parts of the country

EDITOR.

*Hopkinsville, Christian County, Ky. August* 27, 1850.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

BEING engaged in the work of disinterring primitive christianity from the heaps of antichristian rubbish, I doubt not but it will be a source of joy and rejoicing to you to hear of the rapid march and glorious triumphs of the ancient gospel. That you, as well as all who love our common Lord, may "thank God and take courage," I write you this letter.

The church at Noah Springs, established some eighteen months or two years ago, upon the New Testament, has greatly increased her members, and is still increasing. Some are added almost every Lord's day. It commenced with twenty-eight members. They now number about ninety. They have done away their monthly Saturday meetings, and now meet every first day of the week. Their order is as follows:—After meeting early, say between 9 and 10 o'clock, they engage in singing hymns of praise to their exalted King. Next, an appropriate prayer is offered by one of the Elders or Bishops, (for they have four selected from among themselves.) An opportunity is then afforded to any who wish to make a profession of their faith in Jesus as the Messiah. If any come forward upon such profession, they are immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and then they are received into the congregation as fellow-disciples. One of the Elders then instructs the congregation from some portion of the Holy Oracles. Afterwards an exhortation by one of the others is delivered. The Deacons then prepare and furnish the table. One of the Elders, after singing an appropriate hymn, prays, and then breaks the bread. In like manner the wine is poured; and all who have been legally naturalized, and deport themselves as disciples, are authorized to participate, without regard to any human *theory* or *ism*, to commemorate and show forth the Lord's death. A hymn is then sung, and the brethren greet each other as fellow-disciples, by a shake of the hand, and then retire.

I have witnessed the order of many churches, but never witnessed a band of christians more strongly united in christian love. Every face appears to be lighted up with heavenly joy. It looks, indeed, as though they were kindred souls, being members of one body; comforted and guided by one Spirit; called to one glorious hope; serving one Lord; having one faith; submitting to one immersion; having one God and common Father, who is over them all, with them all, and in them all. Almost all who witness their order are constrained to say, "See how these Christians love!" Crowds attend them from all quarters Human opinions and speculations they discard. The sublime facts of the gospel are the theme of their tongues—the joy of their hearts. Though they lay no stress upon *opinions*, they are, as far as I have understood, more united in opinion than any people who profess religion I have ever seen. When any of their members are afflicted, all sympathize with him; when any are happy, all rejoice I have been made to exclaim, O! the renovating, the purifying, the ennobling powers of the "ancient gospel!" May it run and be glorified from the rivers to the ends of the whole earth; till antichrist and antichristian corruption shall be banished forever from the earth, and until every knee shall bend, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father! If such results are produced by your labors, in turning men's minds to the Book of God from fables and dreams, may the great God speed you in them!

*A-propos.*—There is a church in Caldwell county, I am informed, that has been racked and torn about the delectable theory *whether the devil is self-created and eternal, or whether God made him.* They belong to the Little River Association, and are Particulars. *Query*—Would it not be a good thing to get Dr. Noel to come down and "settle the harsh" with them by a little epitome of what the Scriptures teach? They would hear him.

I will now give you some idea of the situation of the churches composing the Bethel Association. The members of this Association are generally men of liberal minds. I do not suppose that the teachers of this Association, as a body, can be excelled by any Association in Kentucky for intelligence and

christian piety, and I am truly hopeful they are looking forward to a thorough reformation. It would be more than I would have time to do, to name each church and their situation; but, sir, I will give you a succinct history of the teachers who labor among them, and leave you to draw your inferences.

We will begin with Elder *Reuben Ross*. He has been much blessed by his Creator in the natural endowments of his mind: a man of strong reasoning powers; of a smooth, easy address. His discourses are mostly of a practical character. Under his administrations of the word the lukewarm and mammon-loving christian feels and trembles in prospect of approaching judgment. In his addresses to sinners he is certainly great. The deep solemnity of his appearance, the sympathy and benevolence of his heart, manifested by the flowing tear, united with his plain and forcible manner in exhibiting the evidences of truth, make the rebellious sinner bow before God, and sue for mercy.—When on the subject of a lost soul, the awful consequence of neglecting the salvation of God, he reminds me of good old Jeremiah when he said, "Oh! that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night over the slain of the daughter of my people!" From the few times I have heard him, I do not hesitate to say, that he preaches the ancient gospel with but little exception. He teaches by taking a whole connexion; and you know this way will not answer to support systems. He is able and convincing.

Elder *William Tandy* has not preached for some considerable time. He is a man of great piety. He is respected and beloved by all. In his manners he is kind, conciliatory, and affectionate. He is truly a beloved disciple. No real christian can avoid loving him. From information, he is in sentiment with Fuller, and much attached to creeds. I am told one or two numbers of the *Chronicle* were sent to him; but from its scurrility and abuse, he returned them to the Editor.

Elder *William Warder* I have heard twice from the stand, upon faith, the operations of the Spirit, and the sufficiency of the word. He is clear, and I should pronounce him a proclaimer of the "ancient gospel." He is truly argumentative, and much beloved for his piety and devotion.

Elder *Robert Rutherford* is a Scotchman by birth; professed religion in Scotland or England, and was there, as I have been informed, attached to a congregation that were called *Sandemanians;* and, until he came to America, never was a member of a church that had a creed other than the New Testament. In his address plain and affable; somewhat reserved and diffident in private intercourse. He insults no man's opinions; he blackens no man's character; he flies from discord as a deadly poison; peace and quietude appear to be his native element. He is a close student of the Scriptures. In his public exhibitions he is lucid and interesting. His Scotch *brogue*, and the clear manner in which he illustrates the subject before him, attract and fix the attention of his audience as by a charm. I have heard him frequently, and consider him an able advocate of the "ancient order of things." As to his deportment, I can say, "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile!"

Elder *John S. Wilson* is much respected; not so eminent for his reasoning powers as for his happy gift of exhortation. His zeal is great. He prides himself in affecting the passions more than in enlightening the judgment. He takes great pleasure in lashing the hypercalvinist, but a little more in abusing you and your views of the gospel. From what I have heard from him in public and private, he considers the man or woman who adopts your views as lost beyond the power of redemption, and the man who inculcates the "ancient gospel" as pointing sinners to fire and pain. He appears to dwell with peculiar delight upon the strifes, discords, &c. produced by your writings; represents the churches in the upper part of this state as bleeding at every pore in consequence thereof. He is Fuller "up to the hub." With him it is, *No physical energy—No religion.* He seems to idolize creeds and confessions of faith; though when he lets fighting alone, he has read the Christian Baptist so much he cannot help giving your views, and at those times preaches quite heterodox,

according to his views of heterodoxy at other times. But, upon the whole, he is a useful and much admired man.

Elder *Isaiah Boone* is a close, logical reasoner; a man of fine fancy; of warm feelings; of great patience; communicative and instructive in private intercourse; fond of innocent satire. In his public exhibitions he shows himself a master workman. The cogency of his reasoning, the beauty of his imagery, his happy illustrations, added to his fine flowing language, elevate him in the estimation of all. The beauties of the gospel appear of late to have burst upon his mind like a column of light, and he seems enraptured with its glories. I have heard him upon faith, the work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of man, and the all-sufficiency of the word. On these subjects, and many others, he is like Sampson among the Philistines. He has come out full in favor of Reformation. He is truly an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures.

Elder — *Adams*, I presume, you know. He is also an able reformer—a useful and an eminent man.

*William T. Major* is also a useful proclaimer of the "ancient gospel." I might name others.

And last, though not least, is Elder *James A. Lindsey*, (who, by the bye, belongs to no Association,) under whose care and labors the Noah Springs Church has grown up. He is clear, forcible, mild, and conciliatory, and is truly doing much good for the churches.

There are some other churches that have commenced reformation. The truth is rapidly spreading. I could give you much interesting information in addition to the above, but my sheet is full.

I am, my dear brother, yours in the hope of immortality. STEPHEN.

## BISHOPS.

GREAT is the love for titles in this reformed republican country. All acknowledge that a love for epithets of honor and titular distinction betrays great weakness and folly, however this passion may be associated with intellectual endowments. The English statesman is not more perplexed to find out new subjects of taxation, than the good people of this country to find out and obtain honorable titles. This passion has, like the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life, invaded what is here called "*the church.*" Hence every thing, from a state bishop down to a class-leader, is in eager demand in this country. Our "benevolent institutions," like the different orders of monks, have created scores of titles unknown before. To find a christian professor worth three thousand dollars, without a military, civil, or a religious title, is as difficult as to find a pensioned clergymen a student of the Bible. Whenever we find a man a little elevated above providing for the wants of every day, we are prompted to inquire for his *title*. There never was a country blessed with so many Generals, Colonels, and Captains, and so few wars and soldiers, as these United States. Never was there a church militant so rich in honorary distinctions, with so few real christians, as the church militant of America.

The world, too, not only bestows ecclesiastical titles, as in the case of religious doctorates, but salutes members of churches by their official names, as commonly as a private in the army addresses his commander by his official designation. At a militia muster in one place, we heard of one citizen introducing to another, Captain A, Deacon B, Major C, and the Rev. D. with as much pertinancy to cus-

tom and inclination as ever did a father call his sons by the name which he had given them.

To lower the haughty pretensions of those who claim to themselves a politically patented episcopacy, as well as to put out of countenance the arrogant title of Reverend and to call things by their proper names, we recommended the term "*bishop*" as the common scriptural designation of all persons having the oversight of a christian community. The Presbyterians and Baptists had long ago assumed in their creeds this name or title as a proper designation of the person or persons who had the oversight of a congregation; but from a peculiar fastidiousness of taste permitted the Methodists and Episcopalians to appropriate it to an officer which the Lord Jesus never instituted. In our tongue the term *overseer* is that corresponding to the obsolete Saxon *piscop*, or bishop, and the Greek *episcopus*. But we discover the same abuse of the term is likely to prevail among us, as that which we opposed in others, viz. the application of it in an appropriated sense to persons not sustaining the office of a christian overseer in a christian congregation. For this cause, and to reform from this rage for titular distinctions, we are constrained to regard the term *obsolete*, and to disclaim the use and acceptation of it. We can no longer in good conscience, apply it to many who are so designated, nor accept it as due to ourselves. A congregation of christians may have, and, as soon as it can, ought to have, its *presidents* and *servants*, or *overseers* and *public servants*, in the common version called *bishops* and *deacons;* but that we should call every leader, preacher, or teacher a *president* or *overseer*, is to abuse the scripture style and to flatter the vanity of those who love fine titles as young Misses love fine clothes. For my own part, not sustaining at this time the particular oversight of any one congregation, I cannot consent to the application of the term to myself: and if I did, I know of no reason which should attach to my name the term *bishop* or *overseer* always and in all places, more than the term *editor* or *farmer*. My name is *Alexander Campbell*, and by this *alone* I choose to be known among men. Neither *Mr.* nor *Rev.* nor *Bishop*, accord with my feelings, calling, nor the cause which I plead. I am sometimes doing the work of a farmer, of an editor, of an evangelist, of a teacher, of a mechanic, a merchant, and of a post-master. No official name better than that of a *public servant*, could designate my various labors, and that carries with it no distinction, and is therefore useless. It will save ink, paper, labor, and time, to designate me by the name by which I expect to be addressed by the angels and by the Saviour and Judge of men; and as there is no other person in this vicinity with whom I can be confounded, there is no necessity for a title or epithet of any sort whatever.

Some of our acquaintance would, methinks, look very much abashed to be saluted in *the great day* with the title *Reverend*, *Elder*, *Bishop*, or *Deacon*, by him who will render to every man according to his works! And how the *Doctors of Divinity* will hang their heads in the presence of that *Paul* whom they have so often misquoted, and of that Saviour, whose command, "*Be not called Rabbi*," they have so often contemned; imagination cannot paint, nor ink and paper describe.

EDITOR.

## MISSIONARIES.

☞THE following excerpt exhibits one of the most serious objections we have felt to the proselyting schemes of an apostate church, now eulogized by the leaders of the missionary projects of the day. That the heathen can be converted to Jesus Christ by an apostate church and by the new gospels of the sects, is, to my mind, as improbable and as impossible, as that the Jews will convert the Pope, his Cardinals, and the See of Rome, to Judaism. ED. M. H.

*From the National [Philadelphia] Gazette.*

IT is in vain to delude ourselves with the belief that we are largely contributing to the civilization of the East, by assisting the Bible Society in "the conversion of the heathen." The knight-errants of Christianity, indeed, pervade every corner of the kingdom. The scriptures, indeed, have been *translated* into a hundred mutilated tongues; and vast sacrifices of money and of truth have been made in the cause of Eastern proselytism.

To convert, it is thought, is to civilize. In my apprehension, to civilize is the most likely method to convert. Our missionaries have been totally unsuccessful, for they commenced at the wrong end. I speak on this point from much observation and a long acquaintance with the subject. They relied on the abstruse dogmas of the church, rather than on the mild doctrines of Christianity, for persuasion. The Turk had to digest the Trinity before he was acquainted with the beautiful morality of the Gospel. The Greek had to stomach the abuse of "the holy fire," before he was made sensible of the advantages of a purer worship. The Catholic had to listen to the defamation of his creed before he was convinced of a more rational religion: and if they were so successful as to shake him in his faith, he had then to decide whether he would be a Methodist, or a Presbyterian, or a Calvinist, or an English Protestant, or a German Lutheran; for our missionaries in Egypt and Syria are of as many conflicting sects. But such is the perversity of the human heart, those wretched Arabs, morally as well as physically blind, continue to "walk in darkness and the shadow of death," obstinately refusing the light we fain would force upon them; and when they are reproved, they have the audacity to say, "We have the faith which our fathers followed, and we are satisfied with it."—*Madden's Travels in Turkey, Egypt, Nubia, and Palestine.*

## A REQUEST.

WE solicit from all the advocates of reform, news of the following character:— 1st. The number of churches and public advocates for the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures without human creeds, for the ancient gospel and order of things, in their counties and neighboring districts of country. 2d. The time when these churches declared their independence; their number and their progress. 3. The success attending the labors of the public advocates in converting men to God. We wish to be able to give correct information on the progress of the *Restoration* every month, that the disciples of Christ who continue stedfast in the Apostles' doctrine may know the passing events and history of the Reformation.

### STATISTICAL INFORMATION.

As a sample of the information which we require, we publish the following list of churches in this county of Brooke, and bordering thereupon:—Wellsburg, containing about 90 members; Bethany, 80; the Cove, 35; King's Creek, 53. In the counterminous parts of Pennsylvania—Pittsburg, 90 members; Nobleštown, 45; Eldersville,

36; Claysville, 16; Hickory, 35. In Ohio—Steubenville, 30; Smithfield, 35; Cadiz, 29; Grave Creek, Va. 36; Wheeling, just commenced, 12. None of these are more than 38 miles from Bethany. Some of them within a few months have commenced, and all of them are without any Bishop, or public teacher, properly so called. They all meet every Lord's day to break the loaf of blessing, to commemorate the death and resurrection of Jesus, to unite in every part of christian worship, and to be instructed by the Apostles' teaching, watching over, and edifying one another in love. Of these fourteen congregations, containing together 624 members, about 350 were immersed during the last year, ending August last. In this district of country not more than three public advocates were employed, and these only occasionally during the year. EDITOR.

## CHRISTIAN PROSCRIPTIONS.

IT seems that the *Christian* preachers are accused of erecting Sanhedrims already, and of exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction *a-la-mode* Mystery Babylon. One proclaimer of immersion for the remission of sins, has been proscribed because he had not the mark on his forehead nor in his hand, deemed orthodox. This *brother*, Isaac Painter, (for I will always fraternize with those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake) was cast out of the Christian connexion by a conference which met in Franklin county, Ohio. A resolution, I am informed, was passed with but one dissenting voice, in said conference, a few weeks ago, prohibiting from the meeting-houses and pulpits, within the jurisdiction of said conference, all persons favorable to the views propagated by *A. Campbell.* I shall be glad to hear a refutation of said report if it can be given. It comes to me in a very credible shape. If the *Christian* people so soon fall into the track of their neighbors, the Regular Baptists, surely they will soon be *orthodox* in their eyes; and the question about the Trinity will be lost in the controversy about the Ancient Gospel. I will mention no names, and go into no details, until farther advised. If these things begin in the tender sapling, what may we look for in the full grown tree?

EDITOR.

## MESSRS. BRANTLY AND CLOPTON.

MR. CLOPTON has given Dr. Noel's *thirty-nine Articles*, with a preliminary and peroration, as constituting his No. 5 against the Christian Baptist. I hope Mr. Clopton will attend to the *morality* side of his course, and adjust those matters and things, concerning that lofty tone of *vital religion*, mentioned in his last, and in my strictures on his Nos. 3 and 4. Since that time, other documents have come to hand, strongly implicating the aforesaid *tone;* and corroborating the *allegata* of my last notices. A voice from Old Virginia testifies that Mr. Clopton has arranged names of renown as opposed to reform, as friends of creeds, who were just the reverse of what he alleges. The son of one of these ancient worthies, alledges

that Mr. Clopton puts Father Shelbourne on the wrong side, and gives his influence where he never placed it.

Other facts, alleged by Mr. Clopton, concerning the Sharon Church in Prince Edward county, are contradicted. So that from all quarters, it appears that this *tone*, high and sonorous, for which Mr. Clopton pleads, must be lowered very much, unless Mr. Clopton *reforms* so much as to regard these tangible matters, called *facts*, and that vulgar virtue, called *truth*, a little more.

The following is Mr. Brantly's notice of the Extra on Remission:

"Baptismal Regeneration. Mr. Alexander Campbell has issued a pamphlet containing about 50 pages—to prove that *immersion* is the only regeneration—that the act of *teaching* commanded by the Saviour in the commission to his Apostles—and the act of *baptizing*, means one and the same thing; that the words *pardon*, *justified*, *santified*, &c. as descriptive of the happiness and privileges of christians, do not signify a "*character*," but a *state*—not a moral and inward transformation, but an outward condition—that John 3d and 5th refers to baptism, and must be understood accordingly; that the Christian writers for the four first centuries knew nothing about any remission of sins, except through the baptismal laver, and many such things."

In the preceding notice, there are *three* express mistatements, besides that concerning the size of the Extra. These are the weapons, and this the mode of warfare, by which the opponents of reform resist our progress. If the Regular Baptists, and all others opposed to reform, can have no better defenders of the traditions of the sects than Messrs. Brantly and Clopton, the people who sustain them are credulous, indeed; and the whole community are more deplorably sunk in ignorance and superstition, than I was myself aware of.

That any man of ordinary sense, to say nothing of a teacher in the Baptist Israel, should say that the terms *pardoned*, *justified*, *sanctified*, represent not a *state*, but an attribute of character, or quality of mind, is to me marvellous beyond expression. Be it known to all men, that W. T. Brantly, Editor of the Columbian Star, represents the terms "pardoned, justified, and sanctified," as expressive of a "moral and inward transformation!" And what is not less admirable, he declares unequivocally that John, 3 and 5, does not refer to baptism!! But, mind me reader, I engage that he dares not dispute this matter in his own pages—nor attempt to sustain his assertions by reason or revelation. He is too prudent to hazard this; lest, as he insinuates, "my brass" should outshine "his gold."

EDITOR.

*Errata.*—In some copies of this No. will be found the following errors:—p. 404, line 19 from bottom, for "*tomsterin*," read *to mysterion*; and in the line following, for "*to mysterion*," read *basileeas*.

*MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

E Mustin, Augusta, Ga. paid vol. 1 for himself, W C Way, C Dickinson, and J Shanon. W Bruce, Bruceville, Ia. paid vol. 1 for S D Piety and G W Lindsey. T B Coleman, Chilesburg, Ky. vol. 1 for T B Anderson, and 3 dollars for himself. J W Green, Albany, New York, paid vol. 1. J Hubbell, Newburg, Ohio, vol. 1 for himself and C Hoard. A Moore, Cynthiana, Ky. paid 6 dollars to Thomas Campbell, Sen. for vol. 1 for himself, M January, and Fanny Henderson. J Anderson, Sparta, Ten. paid vol. 1 for C Stone, and S Ray. J Hawkins, Connersville, Ia. paid vol. 1 for J Smith, G Ginn, G Goodlander, J M Green, and J Shortridge. J Young, Brownsville, Ten. paid vol. 1 for J Estes, J S Abstein, E S Tappin, C Holloway, and W Isby. J G Mitchell, Malaga, Ohio, paid 1 dollar. W H Irwin, Baton Rouge, La. paid vol. 1 for J Stokes and G King. N H Turner, Jackson, Va. paid vol. 1 for himself, L Turner, C H Mallory, H Anderson, and N Diggs. C Buller, Hanover, Ind. paid 10 dollars, for whom not stated. A Reynolds, Dripping Spring, Ky. paid vol. 1 for J Rountree and T Johnson, and 1 dollar for E H Haley. J L Davis, Brattonsville S. C paid vol. 1 for A Abell. W B Simms, Cuckooville, Va. paid vol. 1 for E J Baker, B S Dickinson. J Jordan, C Wood and J Dickinson. M Cole, Charleston, Ind. paid vol. 1 for J Biggs and J Holeman. T M Henley, Lloyd's, Va. vol. 1 for W B ay, W Hill, T Haynes, S Upshaw, and L Duling. Col. W J nnings, Lancaster, Ky. paid 6 dollars for B Poulson; also, vol. 1 for H Turpine, and 1 dollar for J Robinson. Elder B Allen, Brownsborough, Ky paid vol. 1 for A H Kelter, G. Jeffries, R Teaton, J B Curl, and J Hareboi . M Martin, Salem, Ind. paid vol. 1 for himself, R Denny, and S Hardley. T S Allen, Bricksville, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for A Meech, A Wilcox, J Patrick, A P Turner, and S J Varney. B Hicks, Lexington, Ky. paid vol. 1 for A Chinn, and T Hearne. E Hubbard, Deerfield, Ohio, vol. 1, and D Albott, 1 dollar and 50 cents. N H Porter, Kingsville, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for himself, and Ann M Trent, Suffield, Connecticut. L Peebles, Charleston, Ohio, paid vol. 1. D Ewell, Warren, Ohio, paid vol. 1. D Hays, Canfield, Ohio, paid vol. 1. W M'Gaffard, Middlebury, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for L Allen and 1 dollar for himself. J Cahoon, Dover, Ohio, vol. 1 for L Parton and E B Hill. J Brooke, Warren, Ohio, paid 2 dollars. J B Ryal, Carthage, New York, paid vol. 1 for E Elsington, W Terry, E Chase, Mrs. Nancy Bentley, and Miss Ann Bannister. J Haskins, Connersville, Ind. paid vol. 1 for W Thompson, A Dawpensbeck, and 1 dollar for J M Wilson. B S Hendrickson, New York, paid vol. 1 for himself, J Pettigrew, J Covington, Dr. L. Barker, W Powell, R Suttor, L Whitmore, F Duncan, D Monroe, and W Taylor. R Scott, Rhineback Flatts, New York, paid vol. 1 for himself and R Styles. D Kellough, Bloomington, Ind. paid vol. 1 for D Batterton. S G Shropshire, Augusta, Ky. paid for vol. 1. G B Lightfoot, Virginia, paid vol. 1 for J F Bryan, Dr. R Garrett, W Mountforth, and W Drewrey. A Sturdivant, Ravenna, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for S B Weaver, and B Doolittle, and 1 dollar for J M'Kelvey. J Randolph, Hiram, Ohio, vol. 1 for S Harman, S Sanford, and P Allen. E Allen, Auburn, New York, paid vol. 1. W Polke, Bruceville, Ind. paid vol. 1 for Bruce & Polke, and James Polke. W D Jourdan, Locust Shade, Ten. paid vol. 1 for J T Coffee and M Kelly. Washington Duval, Wellsburg, Va. paid for vol. 1. J Hubbard, Richfield, Ohio, paid for vol. 1. W Hopper, Hopper's Tan Yard, Ky. vol. 1 for P Anderson, R Starks, J Solomon, W D Cope, D H Harrison, J Holland, W Martin, B H Logan, and W Dodd. G Ambrose, Darbyville, Ohio, paid for vol. 1. J Stamp, Port Gibson, Mi. paid vol. 1 for R R Stearky, A Pate, N Burvill, L O Bridewell, H Blaylock, Mrs. MacDougall, and himself. J W Jeffreys, Jeffreys' Store, Va. paid vol. 1 for W A Stokes, Jeffreys' Store, Va. Silas Shelbourne, P Hart, and P Barnes, Pleasant Grove, Lunenburg county, Va. W Hankins, Huleysburg, Lunenburg county, Va. Dr. J Smith, W A Stone, and G W Watts, Wattsborough, Lunenburg county, Va. Captain F Lester, Lunenburg Court House, and A Crawford, Charlotte Court House. C Curtis, South Hill, paid for vol. 1.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 10. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1830. Vol. 1.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## THE TIMES—*No. I.*

TIME was when Doctors, and Teachers, and Rabbims, interrogated me, argued with me, and even furnished essays and communications in opposition to the reform which we plead. Time was when Editors were lured to offer an argument for themselves, and an argument against us. We replied—they responded. They resumed their pens—we resumed ours. One, by one, they withdrew from the contest. They left us with all our premises and with all our conclusions, illustrated and confirmed by their opposition. We found ourselves deserted, the arena cleared, and in possession of all our cardinal positions. When reason and argument triumphed, we vainly expected the controversy was over, and that in the 19th century no other arguments than reason and scripture would be resorted to. But the calm was a deceitful one, and our hope was vain.

The time for argument, and reason, and proof, appears to be past. A new mode of warfare against us is now adopted. But no new mode of defending traditions can be adopted; and, therefore, since our opponents abandoned the field of investigation, since they deserted the arena of rational discussion, they have entered the magazines of the Chaldean armory, and have come out panoplied from head to foot in the regimentals of the veteran corps of Mystery, Babylon the Great. Like good soldiers of the old Roman line, each man has his shield embossed with the dogmas of the elders; his head covered with the helmet, the hope of human applause; his heart covered with the breastplate of pride of opinion and lust of power; his loins girded with the belt of detraction; his feet shod with a preparation of religious experience; and brandishing in his hand the sword of *isms*, which is the creed of his fathers.

Thus the champions of human *isms* in religion march forth. The war-song is sung, and the trumpet is heard in our land. The *ultima ratio regum*, the last argument of kings, the thunders of proscriptive decrees, "*No reading—No examination—No discussion*," is heard every where; and we must now submit to martyrdom, with all due deference to those who erect the scaffold or bind the faggots in bundles for our religious destruction. Such is the crisis.

Allegory apart. The precedents set by the Man of Sin are those followed—implicitly followed, every where. The priests and presses have got the people under their control; they have made their consciences and shaped their religious taste after their own models; and they are determined to keep them under their shackles. While there was any hope that we might project, or take up a piece of some human system, providing in it pulpits, salaries, and high places—requiring consecrated heads and hands; while there was any hope that we might have mysteries, and interpreters of mysteries, like other sectaries, there was some leniency shewn us—some semblance of fair play, and a few grains of impartiality in a pound of opposition. But now it is, "Touch not, taste not, handle not." The priests and presses now say, "*Read not anything written by the Reformers!*" What did Mystery Babylon say or decree more tyrannical than this? Pull out your eyes and stop your ears, you sons of the Clergy! "Read not, hear not a reformer!" Read our side! Hear us! says Dr. Noel, Rev. Clopton, and Messrs. A, B, and C, religious Editors.

It is a fact that some Baptist Doctors and Editors have not only virtually, but in due form, advised the public, on pain of their displeasure, not to read any thing we write, nor to suffer us to speak to the people in their vicinities. What did the Popes of Rome, in the darkest ages, more than this? What can be done more than this to lead the people blindfolded to perdition. Would not Satan's triumphs be complete could he have all the writings of the christian Prophets and Apostles proscribed from human eyes and human ears! And is not this the same policy in miniature? Who conquers by *darkness?* Who but the Devil, the Pope, and regal tyrants, ever attempted to gain, retain, or secure an empire by putting out light and covering the earth with darkness? And does not every man who says, "Read me only, and read nothing else than what I direct," in fact put out your eyes, and take from you the means of light which God has given you. Every editor, speaker, and preacher, who shuts a meeting-house door, excludes from his columns that which opposes his own views, proscribes the books he does not like, and anathematizes the man who calls him to an account—only wants room to be a Boniface, a Leo, or a Pius III. The authors of the Beaver, Franklin, and Appomattox Decrees, would just as certainly act the part of the most intolerant Popes of the darkest ages, as a kid will become a goat, or an egg become a serpent, in congenial circumstances.

What in the face of common sense does that man claim (and every council of men is composed of units) who says, "*Hear me*, and them only whom I command you to hear." Does he not mean, 'I am infallibly right, and all my associates are infallibly right;—my soul for yours, if you hear me and me only, all shall be well;—only permit me to judge for you as you cannot judge for yourselves; and as I am always correct in my conclusions, you must be always safe and happy in regarding my decisions in the light of an oracle from God!'

Might I not ask such religious demagogues, Did not the Roman Catholic Clergy fight with your armor against the first Reformers of

Popery? Did not the Church of England use the same weapons against the reformers of British Episcopacy? And may I not add, If the laity had taken the advice of their teachers, and heard and read according to their commands, would not the same barbarism and superstition have covered this continent which once covered all Europe, and which yet covers all those parts of the earth where the people refused to hear and judge for themselves? Those who feared "the Pope's bulls" and "the Inquisition," lived and died ignorant and polluted Papists; and those who are governed by the Beaver, Franklin, and Appomattox Decrees, will live and die in the ignorance, enthusiasm, or superstition of sectarianism.

Christians, *true Christians*, never persecuted. They never erected tribunals for orthodoxy; they never proscribed men for matters of opinion; and they who call themselves Christians, and mimic the Mother of Harlots, had better pause and examine their title to the denomination *Christian*.

But will the people pluck out their own eyes, and stop their own ears at the hint or anathema of such men who claim to be their infallible monitors! Will the people suffer themselves to be sold? nay, will they sell themselves? Will they formally covenant and agree to give themselves up for ever—conscience, understanding, will, and affections to the care of Messrs. Clopton, Noel, and Brantly, who have now drawn the covenants, the bills of sale, with the blanks for signature? Stop, my fellow-citizens, and think before you sign and seal the bond of your eternal slavery to Fullerism, Calvinism, and *humanism*, under the sponsorship of such godfathers! Let your real friend, whom they denounce because he will offer them no incense, nor lay a victim on their altar—I say, let your real friend, who seeks your present and future salvation, remind you of Peter's and Paul's exhortations: "Whether is it better in the sight of God to hearken unto these men rather than unto God, judge you." "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." EDITOR.

## HISTORY OF SIN,

### INCLUDING THE OUTLINES OF ANCIENT HISTORY.—NO. V.

III. According to the plan adopted, we are to give a view of the great events, or epochas, from Cyrus' accession to the united thrones of Media and Persia to the conquest of Babylon by Alexander the Great. This period extends from B. C. 534 to B. C. 330, comprehending 204 years.

1. The first transaction worthy of notice in this period is the celebrated edict of Cyrus, granting liberty to the Jews to return and rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, which had been destroyed 70 years before by Nebuchadnezzar. Daniel, who was anxiously waiting for the close of the period allotted for the captivity to expire, knew that the time was come, and by showing to Cyrus that his own name had been already standing upon the rolls of Isaiah's prophecy upwards of 100 years, as the chosen instrument of this glorious deliverance, obtained from him a royal privilege to restore the captive Jews, and renewedly to consecrate a temple to the Lord of Hosts.

2. The next circumstance which engages our attention is the death of Cyrus, which happened 7 years after the death of Cyaxares, 9 years after the fall of Babylon, and 30 years after he began the war with the Assyrians. After a life of 63 years, filled with great actions, he was permitted but 7 years to wear a

crown. Cyrus died at 70 years of age. He left two sons, Cambyses and Smerdis, the former of whom was appointed his successor. To enter into a particular narration of the actions of every succeeding king, would be beyond the design of this lecture. I shall just state the order of succession, with the length of the several reigns, and then proceed to the consideration of the most important events. Cambyses reigned 7 years; Smerdis, 8 months; Darius Hystaspes, 36 years; Xerxes I. 21 years; Artaxerxes Longimanus, 41 years; Xerxes II. 45 days; Sogdianus, a few days; Darius Nothus, 19 years; Artaxerxes Mnemon, 46 years; Ochus, 21 years; Arses, 2 years; Darius Codomannus, 6 years.

3. Cambyses was of a disposition directly contrary to that of his father Cyrus. He undertook two expeditions, one against Egypt, the other against Ethiopia. Succeeding in the first, and fully glutting his vengeance by the most unprovoked cruelties, he attempted the latter. An immense army was raised, and ambassadors sent to the king of Ethiopia, demanding submission. The king, in return, presented Cambyses with a bow of great strength which he used, adding, that until the Persians could learn to use such arms, they must not hope to conquer the Ethiopians. Enraged at this answer, Cambyses ordered his army immediately to march, unfurnished with provisions for such an undertaking. Several days they traversed the desert in quest of the Ethiopians, till, at length, hunger reduced them to the dreadful alternative of killing every tenth man as food for the rest. A great part of the army being lost, Cambyses returned to Egypt, where he appeased his mortified pride by redoubled cruelties towards his innocent subjects. He murdered his brother, his sister, his friends, and his enemies, with the same unmingled and relentless malice. He was succeeded by Smerdis, the usurper, who was taken off by a conspiracy, after having reigned but 8 months.

4. The family of the great Cyrus becoming extinct, Darius Hystaspes, a distant branch of the royal family, was elected to the crown. Under pretence of revenging an irruption, Darius collected a vast army of 700,000 men, and marched to the Bosphorus of Thrace, a narrow strait between Europe and Asia, near which is now situated the city of Constantinople. Baffled in his Scythian expedition, he tried his fortune in another direction, and was successful in subduing the greater part of India to his dominion. After his return from his Indian expedition, he found that the Grecian colonies of Asia Minor, which had long before been established upon the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and were become powerful, had revolted under Aristagoras. An army of Ionians, being joined by a body of Athenians, burnt the city of Sardis; but were soon after defeated and dispersed, and the Asiatic Greeks again reduced to their former state of subjection.

Darius, from that time, resolved to make war upon Greece. The Persians were routed; but were pursued by the Athenians with unremitted destruction, till they finally arrived in Asia, having lost a great part of their army and fleet. Thus ended the second endeavor of Darius to subjugate Greece.

5. Darius died soon after the battle of Marathon, and was succeeded by his son Xerxes the Great. As soon as he was seated upon the throne, he resolved, contrary to the advice of his wisest counsellors, to revenge the flames of Sardis and the bloody plain of Marathon by the annihilation of the Grecian states. One million seven hundred thousand foot, and 80,000 horse, composed his land army, while the naval forces amounted to 517,610 men, the whole attended by an equal number of servants, woman, grooms, &c. so that the whole was found to consist of the astonishing number of 5,283,220, falling little short of the census of the whole United States for the year 1800. While viewing this vast collection, with the greatest transports of joy and self-gratulation, Xerxes was observed suddenly to burst into a flood of tears. Being asked by his uncle the cause of his sudden transition, he is said to have replied, "One hundred years hence not one of this immense multitude will remain alive." In seven days, without intermission, the army was transported from Asia to Europe. Xerxes was advancing from the North, and threatened, ere long, to

deluge Attica and the Peloponnesus with his millions, when Leonidas, with 4,000 men, seized the pass of Thermopylæ, the only way by which Xerxes could come into Attica, and determined to perish rather than yield the pass. Xerxes approached, and, observing this handful of men, sent heralds to demand their arms. Leonidas returned in answer, "Come and take them." Stung with this reply, the king ordered the Medes to go with manacles and fetch them to him bound. But after a short conflict, they were obliged to seek safety by flight. The famous immortal band, consisting of 10,000 brave soldiers completely armed, next attempted to subdue the stubborn courage of the Greeks; but were repulsed with great loss. The Persians then tried their fortune; but met an ignominious defeat. Xerxes began now to be sick of his expedition, and to despair of being able with his millions to conquer these 4,000 Greeks, when a perfidious deserter informed him of a secret passage round the mountain; 10,000 men were instantly despatched, who appeared in the rear of the Greeks. Leonidas, perceiving that all was lost, resolved to sell his life as dearly as possible, and sending away the auxiliaries, he remained with his 300 Spartans and about as many Thespians, and prepared for battle. In the first onset that was made Leonidas fell. Five times they were attacked on all sides, and five times the Persians were driven back with dreadful slaughter. At length, overpowered by numbers, and literally buried under the weapons and bodies of their enemies, they all fell, except one who escaped to Sparta to announce what a bloody trophy his countrymen had raised to their memory. Leonidas holds the palm of courage; nor have the annals of time found his rival.

On the same day of the battle of Thermopylæ, the Grecian fleet of 120 sail had an engagement with the Persian, of about 1,000, in which the Greeks had considerably the advantage. A short time afterwards the two fleets came to another engagement at Salamis, where Themistocles was completely victorious. The Greeks lost 40 ships, and the Persians 200. Xerxes who was an eye witness of this battle, now took the alarm, and leaving Mardonius with 300 000 men, hastened back to the Hellespont, for fear the Greeks would break down his bridge of boats, and forever cut off his return. His army being pressed by famine, and he more pressed by terror, he left them behind, and arriving at the Hellespont with a few attendants, found his bridge had been dispersed by a storm, and was obliged to cross in a small fishing-boat.

Mardonius, with his 300,000 men, after having ravaged the open country of Attica, came to a general battle with Aristides and Pausanius, the Grecian commanders at the city of Platæa. Although the Persians appeared to be animated by an unknown courage, and Mardonius signalized himself by his personal valour, yet they were utterly routed and Mardonius slain. On the same day of the battle of Platæa, the Grecian fleet, agreeably to the direction of the oracle, "to defend themselves with wooden walls," obtained an equally illustrious victory over the remainder of the Persian fleet at the promontory of Mycale. This final stroke annihilated the Persian force, and, from among such a constellation of patriot heroes as the world has seldom seen, gained for Themistocles the prize of the most glorious achievement. Thus closed the famous invasion of Greece by Xerxes the Great, B. C. 479.

6. The retreat of the 10,000 Greeks from the heart of the Persian Empire, forming one of the most brilliant actions recorded in history, will, for a moment, engage our attention. Considering the difficulties to be surmounted, this is universally allowed to be the noblest retreat through an enemy's country that was ever performed; and has placed the name of Xenophon on a level with that of the greatest commanders. Darius Nothus dying left two sons, Artaxerxes Mnemon and Cyrus the younger. Artaxerxes was no sooner seated on the throne, than he detected a conspiracy to depose him, at the head of which was his brother Cyrus. Cyrus was seized and condemned to death; but by the influence of Parasatis, his mother, Artaxerxes was prevailed upon to send him back to his government in Asia Minor. Cyrus, as soon as he was at liberty, pursuant to his object of dethroning his brother, pretended a quarrel with a neighboring satrap, and openly collected forces wherever they were to

be obtained: 113,000 men were collected, of whom 12,000 were Peloponnesian Greeks, commanded by Clearchus the Spartan; and after a tedious march of 93 days, or nearly 1,800 miles, Cyrus arrived at Curraxa, a small town not far from Babylon, where Artaxerxes lay with an army of 1,000,000 men. A battle was fought, long and bloody. The Greeks were victorious wherever they struck; and had it not been for the impetuous valor of Cyrus, might have gained the field. But he suddenly perceiving his brother at a little distance from the edge of the battle, cried out, "I see him! I see him!" threw himself into the midst of the king's guards, and cutting his way, attacked Artaxerxes in person. The fate of the day depended upon the issue of this unnatural conflict. Seldom, or never, have mankind witnessed such a shocking scene. For some time the royal brothers fought with desperate fury for the crown of Persia, like a lion and tyger contending for the empire of the desert. Artaxerxes' horse fell under him, and he received several wounds, when his guards discharged at once a shower of arrows at Cyrus, the moment he raised his faulchion to give the fatal stroke; at length, covered with wounds, he sprang into the arms of Artaxerxes, who received him upon the point of his javelin; Cyrus fell and instantly expired. His army thus deprived of its leader, fought for a long time with an ill-directed valor, till being surrounded by overwhelming numbers, they were cut to pieces or dispersed, except the Greeks, to the number of 10,000, who, repulsing every attack, still maintained their ground and refused to capitulate.

Artaxerxes, perceiving that the Greeks were determined to resist to the last, gave them permission to depart to their own country; secretly giving orders, however, to his generals and the nations they were obliged to march through, to intercept them, and, if possible, to cut off their retreat.

The generals of the Greeks being all cut off by treachery, they first choose several persons to conduct the army in this dangerous adventure. Among these was Xenophon, a young man of extraordinary talents as a soldier, a statesman and scholar. The narrative he has given us of this expedition is justly ranked among the noblest historical efforts, and has obtained for him the title of the "Hume of Greece." Without any delay, they commenced their march, in the form of a hollow square, the baggage and attendants in the centre. Having continued a few days, marching with little molestation, the Persian army appeared behind them, ready to take every advantage, and throw every obstruction in their way. Often they were suddenly attacked; but the convigilance of Xenophon, aided by the intrepidity of the Greeks, defeated every attempt, and prevented every ambuscade.

The broad and deep river Tigris at length stopped their progress, and having no boats to cross, this band of heroes resolved to cross the lofty ridges of the Carducian mountains. Leaving behind their beasts and slaves, they began to ascend the mountains. The heights and narrow defiles had been seized by the native mountaineers, and detatchments of the Persian army, and thus every summit was to be gained by dint of valor, every defile to be cleared by the edge of the sword. After a continued struggle for seven days, they crossed the mountains, and descended upon the plains of Armenia. But here a new trial awaited them, upon the bank of a river, 200 feet broad, which they must cross. The Persian army was close upon their heels, and another Armenian army was posted upon the opposite bank to dispute their passage. They crossed, however, the water in some places up to their armpits, beneath showers of missile weapons, drove the Armenians, and gained the open country.

After traversing several deserts, and passing the Euphrates near its source, they were obliged to face death in a different and more dreadful form. The snow lay upon the ground to a great depth, at the same time a cutting North wind blew in their faces, and almost prevented their breathing. Many lost their eye-sight—many had their hands and feet frozen, so that they perished—many died of hunger—many sunk in the snow, "stretched out, bleaching in the northern blast," a miserable prize to gratify the exasperated Persians. Thus they marched for several days. They crossed the territories of the Pha-

sians and Chalybes, the most fierce, barbarous and warlike people of Asia, defeating them in several engagements; and constantly struggling with the winds, and sleet, and snows of that inhospitable region, till they gained the summit of Jecqua, the highest mountain in that country. Suddenly a confused shout was raised by the van which soon prevailed throughout the army, mingled with the joyful exclamation "The sea! the sea!" The soldiers in an extacy of joy, embraced their general, and dropping upon their knees, testified their gratitude to their gods with floods of tears. The distant prospect of the Euxine, whose heaving bosom would soon bear them to their native shores, melted their hearts, always inflexible in toil, in hunger and in blood. They erected a pile of stones upon the top of the mountain as a trophy to tell their story to succeeding generations.

After surmounting one more ridge, the mountains of Colchis, and defeating a final attempt to oppose their return, they descended upon the shores of the Euxine. Here they embarked, and after a prosperous voyage, again landed in Asia Minor, whence they had started 15 months before; after having accomplished a retreat of 2,325 miles through an enemy's country. Although constantly harassed by their enemies, and pressed by various other misfortunes, they triumphed over all, and performed one of the most illustrious exploits in the annals of military fame.

*Whelpley's Lectures.*

## DIALOGUE.

*Amicus.*—WELL, friend Alexander, the Philistines are upon you. Your Regular Baptists, you used to say, were like the sheep: they could not persecute. Methinks the sheep are now making war against the goats.

*Editor.*—True, friend Amicus, I have said that the Quakers and Baptists were not addicted to persecution, except with the tongue; and that, you know, deserves not the name of persecution: for the Saviour distinguished *persecution* from *reviling*, and speaking evil against a person. "Happy are you," said he, "when men shall revile and prosecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely for my namesake." But the Baptists of this day are degenerate, compared with the Baptists of other times. The Baptists differ nothing from the most aspiring sectaries in our country, save in *immersion*. They are immersed Presbyterians and Episcopalians, and, with some exceptions, are as worldly and as secular in their managements as the sects from which they sprang. They have the same thirst for colleges, theological schools, splendid meeting-houses, pew rents, vestry rooms, singer choirs, and presbyteries, according to their means, as any other sect in this country. If they have not as many fine things as their neighbors, it is because they have not so much money as their neighbors. Not so were the Baptists of former times. But having become more popular in this country within forty years than in former times, and having many proselytes from other sects, they have in their fraternity the leaven of all other sects working in concert with all the passions of human nature; and, therefore, it is not surprizing to find them as secular as the Presbyterians.

*Am.*—But, were you not apt to say that the system would not permit them to go as far as other sects in persecuting, and do you not say that the system is the cause of persecution rather than the people under it?

*Ed.*—True, I have thought so: but those who proscribe and anathematize reformers and reformation, have transcended the system, or rather abandoned it; and, in so doing, act more in accordance with their own spirit than with the spirit of the system which they acknowledge. Besides there are but a few individuals, compared with the aggregate mass of the community, who exhibit this spirit, and the system affords a few such spirits an ample opportunity to carry out their proscriptive measures to a greater length than any other system in the christian world. I now speak of the high courts, called advisory councils or associations. There is much democracy, in appearance; but, in reality, much tyranny is exercised in these high courts. The French democracy issued in the most relentless tyranny and cruelty ever exhibited amongst a civilized people; and the Baptist high court democracy is capable, and sometimes issues in scenes, of proscription and despotism, as incompatible with christian liberty and liberality as the despotism of a Tripolitan Dey is with the freedom and liberty of an American Republic.

A government of law is always a safe government. But when a government of men, controlled only by their own will, passion, or prejudice, is supreme, there is an end of personal liberty and safety. Such is, in fact, the government of a Baptist high court. This I beg leave to explain.

The Baptists, in theory, say that an association has no power over individual professors. The constitution of their advisory councils, therefore, makes no provision for the trial of any individual christian. But it so happens that associations are composed of churches, and churches of individuals, and sometimes an individual becomes obnoxious, not only to a church, but to an association of churches, and the particular church to which he belongs cannot, or will not, control him to the good will and pleasure of the whole association. What, then, is to be done? The constitution makes no provision for such a case, and, therefore, if the association wish to reach him, they must do as Dr. Noel did, in the so called Franklin Association, make a law for the case. This law being made for the case, and by the person or persons opposed to the individual, we may naturally expect it more to favor the accuser than the accused.

There is no possibility, while human nature is as it is, that the accused can obtain justice, when his accuser makes the law for his trial, and is both judge and witness in his case. The decree comes out in the form of an "*advice*," or a "*recommendation*." If, however, the advice is not taken, and the recommendation is not well received, there is an excision of the church for the sake of the individual. A non-fellowship is declared, which is the highest censure in any sect not having an inquisition at its command. The reputation of the church is attacked, she is called heterodox, and an exclusion from pulpits and meeting-houses are the compliments which follow this ceremony.

In such cases the accused neither appears in his own person, nor by proxy. He is not heard in his own behalf. They make a creed

for him, and then anathematize him for the sake of the creed, which they have put into his mouth. Such, in fact, is the system in detail.

A single individual, who is cunning and malicious enough, may bring a whole Association into his measures; and so it frequently happens that a majority of an Association may vote the reprobation of a church, or an individual, without knowing any thing about the person or persons reprobated. This was the case in the Appomattox, Franklin, and Beaver Associations. Even books which the nine-tenths of the voters never saw, have been proscribed and a character condemned of which they were perfectly ignorant, save through the representation of his accusers. Such is, such has been, and such must be the result in every court which assumes to judge men when the constitution makes no provision for such judicature. No man's reputation is safe under such a government. Such courts have not even the forms of justice. Indeed, it is a tribunal erected by the clergy, and in direct contravention of the principles of the congregations. They assume to be independent communities. And were it not for the clerical interest and influence these high courts could not be endured. They have generally been theatres of war and strife, or theatres for the gaining of popular applause. The preachers are as jealous of one another as rival suitors for the affection of a favorite mistress. And while they profess brotherly kindness for one another, they stand before the people as competitors for their approbation, and eager to seize the palm or place the laurel on their own brow. Much observation and an intimate acquaintance with the spirits which figure on these theatres has confirmed me in these conclusions.

*A.*—Why, then, Mr. Editor, have you so frequently visited them?

*Ed.*—For the same reason which led Paul to the Jewish synagogues.

*A.*—I should think, from your representation, that a Presbyterian synod, or session, or presbytery, was likely to be a more just tribunal than one of these advisory councils.

*Ed.*—In this you are correct. Before these tribunals the accuser has the forms of trial, and he may choose his own propositions if it be a controversy about opinion or faith; and if condemned, the error alleged is in such terms as he will assent to. But not so in a Baptist Association. I am represented by Dr. Noel and Abner Clopton as avowing that John Calvin was a teacher of deism, without any specification, leaving it to every one to imagine whether it was his predestination or final perseverance; whereas I spoke of his views of natural theology. But I need not specify; almost every opinion or article of belief is presented either in a distorted, mutilated, or garbled form, so as excite the *odium theologicum* and the religious nausea in the minds of the uninformed and superstitious populars.

*A.*—I never thought that ecclesiastical councils, however constituted, differed much from one another. They are one and all for the benefit of the clergy. During my short life I have visited all sorts of Sanhedrims in this country, and the amount of my observation and experience has been this:—They are all traps for honest and able

men. If a man be immoral and unworthy of public confidence, it requires not these tribunals to break him down. He falls either by a single congregation, or by his own hands. Neither can synods nor advisory councils long keep him up, if grossly heterodox or indecently immoral. But I have seen the most able and the most honest men almost invariably the victims of these tribunals. It has been so in the bounds of my acquaintance. If any man should overtop the common growth of his species, these Sanhedrims are a happy invention to put him down, and to keep him down. 'Tis easy to find an excuse, a signal for an attack. Some unsoundness in the faith, some expression which savors of heterodoxy, which, in another person of humbler endowments, would never have been noticed, is constructive treason in him, and a crime of such malignity as to doom him to the higher excommunication. If once devoted to the clerical anathema, it matters not how unblameable his life—how scriptural his teaching and views—he must be put down. The forms of trial and justice are all that may be expected in the best of these tribunals. A respect for public opinion makes these forms necessary; and that their acts may have weight with the community, it is necessary to have the sanctified aspect of much "zeal for the divine glory," and prayers and sighs are requisite to consecrate the procedure. Without the machinery of such courts such measures would be unavailing.

They are of other uses: for even excommunication is but subservient to the ambition and covetousness of the clerical fraternity; and these high courts consult for the good of the class called teachers. This is most obvious in some of them, and inferable from the acts of others. They often go on peaceably for some years. So do the most ambitious monarchs in the world. There is a calm even in the most boisterous climates. Peace now prevails among those who have been belligerents for years. Ambition has its objects, and ambitious men must have their rivals before the storm of war gathers all its furies. Look over your peaceable Baptists, in the present crisis, and only see how the war spirit rages among the mighty chiefs.

*Ed.*—It rages, it is true, with considerable fury; but it is only some half dozen of spirits which have raised the storm of war. But the system affording them such facilities, there is no telling where this scene of pride and enmity may end. Two or three spirits, one of them since excommunicated for gross immorality—one of them now lying almost a sot in every tavern—another of them living with another man's wife—were among the first to stir up sedition among the people. At that time they made long prayers, and wore a sanctified appearance, and had some influence among the people. A bull of excommunication was issued by one Association— re-echoed by another—and so the excitement ran, till, like the Ephesian crowd which beset Paul, the major part knew not what had brought them together. The lowest tools are employed in this business of detraction and proscription. The author of a late pamphlet is going about from village to village, *vending it for whiskey*, in aid of the anathematizers!— All do not know the manner of spirits which are now at work in this

crusade for orthodoxy. But as Paul said, so say we, "The sins of some men are so notorious, that they go before them to judgment. Some, indeed, they follow." EDITOR.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

## JOURNAL OF A TRAVELLER—[*Concluded.*]

### OHIO.

*August 9th.* TOOK the stage between 7 and 8 o'clock, A M.—commenced reading, for the second time, the Debate between Campbell and Owen. After riding 17 miles to B. two gentlemen got in, a Mr. G. and Esq. B. Mr. G. soon afterwards took my book and handed it to his companion, saying: "*This* is the work," &c. When something like the following dialogue took place:—

*Esq. B.*—Did you ever read it?

*Mr. G.*—No, it is not worth reading. Its a—

*Esq. B.*—What is the point principally labored in it?

*Mr. B.*—I don't know—but believe—indeed, I have felt so little interested in it, that I cannot say exactly what.

*Traveller.*—How very differently do we think and act! You have never read this work, you say, Mr. G. and yet pronounce judgment against it—declare it not worth reading. I have read it all once through, and was so much interested in it, as now to have commenced reading it again. The subject is certainly of all the most important.

*Mr. G.*—Yes—Well—Campbell is no doubt a man of—&c.—and—but—I don't agree with him in sentiment.

*Traveller.*—And wherein do you disagree?

*Mr. G.*—I profess to be an Episcopalian.

*Traveller.*—And Mr. Campbell professes to be a christian.

Here Esq. B. put in his word; upon which considerable conversation ensued: the result of all was, that before we parted Esq. B. took of me a copy of the Debate, and Mr. G. said he thought *he* must by and by procure it, when he could find time to read it.

'An effort was made sometime since in B.' said Esq. B. 'to have but one meeting and three ministers. A common fund was raised for this purpose; one half of which was to go to a Presbyterian minister, one-fourth to a Methodist, and the remaining one-fourth to support Unitarian preaching; all agreeing to attend every Lord's day, the same as if their own minister preached. The Unitarian party not being able to obtain one of their own sect, employed a Mr. A*****. The Presbyterians attended a few times, till Mr. A. began to proclaim immersion for the forgiveness of sins; when they cried out "*Campbellism!*" and quit. The Unitarians complained. The Presbyterians justified themselves by saying, "We did not agree to hear a *Campbellite*. If you had obtained a Unitarian preacher we would have heard him." * * * * *

Whilst at the tavern in A. I was called on by brother A. F. the only Regular Baptist man I have seen since I left Buffalo. He tells me that the church in *Ashtabula* is pure from Campbellism*—that they remain stedfast in the orthodox faith, and that only one person has been added to them by baptism for three or four years.

* *The Rev. Mr. F. was mistaken.*

NEW YORK.

*Lord's day, Aug.* 15.—Attended worship in the Dutch Reformed Church, and heard the Rev. Mr. S—. A. M. from Matthew v. 13. P. M. from Heb. vi. 17, 18—two tolerably good orthodox discourses; but nothing very remarkable in either. The following I record of the morning's discourse as of ordinary occurrence among textuary divines:—

"Christians," he said, "were the salt of the earth: therefore he would show, 1st. Why they are so called. 2d. How the salt loses its saltness; and, 3d. The dreadful consequences." He *read* very well under the first head: but when he came to the second, he changed the person. "The salt which loses its saltness," said he, "is not true christians, but false professors!!" I saw where the shoe pinched—a certain *doctrine* is in danger! —the *doctrine* of all saints' final perseverance! The P. M. meeting was opened by singing, first,

*"Go teach the nations, and baptize."*

Then said Mr. S. "*The child* will now be presented for baptism." About half of the congregation arose,—some looked this way, and some that. At length the father and mother and child appeared before the sacred desk. Mr. S. prayed. He read a homily from the canons of his church. He read the articles of obligation devolving upon the parents; to which they assented by bowing their heads. He descended from the pulpit. He came to the table. He put his fingers into a bowl of water. He approached the mother holding up the child. (The father stood on her right hand.) He whispered [I suppose a question.] She whispered [I suppose the answer.] He put his fingers on the child's forehead and said; "Christopher, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen." He again ascended, up where he was before. He again prayed, and gave out another hymn, which was sung; and then came the sermon—the farewell sermon: for he told us at the close, that he had concluded to leave. Nobody seemed to feel sorry or to look sad, but *one*. I thought *he* felt sorry. He prayed. They sung again, and he dismissed with the usual benediction.

* * * * * *

CONNECTICUT.

*September* 1*st*. Between 1 and 2 o'clock P. M. met in the vestry of the Baptist meeting house about 30 *clerical* and *lay* brethren (so they were pleased to call one another) who had there convened, as delegates from several of the neighboring churches to attend a *conference* with the N. H. Church. This first meeting, however, was preliminary to make arrangements. A Moderator and Clerk being appointed, and two or three of the Clergy to address the meeting this afternoon, and a disposition made of all for the evening; the bell now called us into the body of the house. The delegates sat together in the body pews, the Moderator with the Clerk on his right hand, and the Pastor of N. H. Church on his left, took their seats facing us in front of the pulpit. After prayer, reports from the churches were called for. The first report was from the church with whom they met,

"They had, for a long season," said the reporter, "enjoyed a *cold season*—had passed through trials—experienced darkness," &c. &c. Several others of like enjoyments reported, when one of the delegation arose and delivered an address to such—another prayed, and all sung:

"*Come, Holy Spirit, Heavenly Dove.*"

After this, I left the meeting. At 4 o'clock met brother J. M. C. a disciple, who was immersed about two years since by S. R. in Ohio: with whom I had a very agreeable interview. At 6 o'clock called at brother R. B—'s, where I took tea, spent the evening, lodged, breakfasted and dined the next day. Brother B. is a Baptist, who, for some time past, has stood aloof from all the Regulars and their enterprizes. With him, too, I had much conversation on testimony and faith, opinions and speculations.

*September 2d*—9 oclock A. M. I again went to the Baptist meeting house "to see the end." And here it may be well to observe, it is understood that all the public doings of this day were *arranged* before hand. The persons were selected to speak—their subjects given them, and the character which each should address: two or three extempore volunteers only to be excepted. *Nunc, ecce signum!*

The Moderator prays, and makes a few general remarks—says he sees before him some of the aged, middle-aged, youth, &c. "Now ☞*if* any have a word to *the aged*, they will improve this opportunity—"

Rev. Mr. S. arises and addresses *the aged*. 1st. *Saints*. The importance of being engaged in all the benevolent institutions of the day. 2d. *Sinners*. "What shall I say to such? Most who give evidence of a change of heart, do it before they pass the age of 33 years. . . . . He points them to a day of judgment. He exhorts, Be ye reconciled to God."

The Moderator again arises, and says: "I see that most of this congregation are young. Now, *if*," &c.

A young man* arises—says he has a message from the Lord to them, and it is, "Prepare to meet thy God!" But how shall you come? Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Should I never see your faces again, I would say, *Prepare to meet thy God!*

A brother F. arises and makes his speech. Tells his experience—says he has tried these things, &c. &c. Perhaps I shall never see you again in this world. My dear friends, let me tell you,—

A brother W. adds a few remarks, and they sing:

"*Young people all, attention give*
"*While I address you in God's name.*"

The Moderator mentions *family prayer*, and again says, "*if*," &c.

A brother arises, and speaks of Abraham and his purity, then of other saints. When we go out in the morning, we know not that we shall ever return—

The Pastor, J. P. arises—says it is an interesting occasion to him—speaks of the work of the ministry—the responsibility of the ambassadors of Christ, and *confesses*, in general terms, *his sins* of unfaithfulness, &c. in time past, and his determination to be a better minister in time to come.

Rev. Mr. S. arises and addresses the Pastor thus: "I trust the great Head of the church has called you by his grace. I would not have any one officiate in this work who can follow—whose feelings will let him follow, any other calling. Charges and exhorts him.

The Moderator now says to the church, (which by the bye were all seated together before him,) "You have heard the *confession* of your minister. We are informed that you are prepared, before the conference to renew your covenant," &c. "First, however, have *you* nothing to *confess?*" . . . .

* *Whether of the* clergy *or* laity, *I know not; and when uninformed, in these minutes I call all brethren.*

A brother arises and *confesses for the church.* 'We have sinned—have been too remiss in duty—have done those things which we ought not to have done, and have left undone those things which we ought to have done:' or, to this effect.

The church next arise and *renew their covenant,* the Pastor reading it out of a little book.

The Moderator addresses the church while standing, reminding them of what they had been called to suffer within a few months past—"to part with a minister, who was dear to them: but, we congratulate you, and rejoice with you, that you now have another in whom you are united," &c. Speaks of their duties to hold up his hands, and that *they be engaged in all the benevolent operations of the day.*

After they had resumed their seats, the Moderator requested them further to signify their union with their Pastor (not that he would question the sincerity of what they had just done) by getting up again, walking out of their pews one after another, and *taking him by the right hand.* They did so. In the mean while, the delegation and congregation arose and sung:

"*From whence doth this union arise,*
*That hatred is conquer'd by love?*"

A brother prays.

The Moderator now says: Probably there are some here present who would gladly have walked out with the church, and with them have taken the hand of their Pastor. but they are not *of* them. *If,* now, any one has a word to the *disconsolate sinner,* we will hear him.

A brother arises and addresses such.

[Of this I took no minutes.]

Rev. Mr. G. succeeds him in addressing the sinner. "O remember, that your eternal all is now, this day, at stake; and devils are watching, and angels likewise! O, ye awakened sinners! O, ye awakened sinners! Heaven and hell are before us—life and death! May God send down his Holy Spirit, for his Son's sake.

Rev. Mr. S. J. prays.

The Moderator again says: *If* any of the brethren feel it their privilege to address such as have *experienced religion,* but have not professed it, they will now have an opportunity.

A brother arises and addresses such!

[No minutes.[

The Moderator next says: "The last, that on this occasion will be addressed, is the *impenitent*" [emphatically, *the impenitent.*]

Rev. Mr. J. performs this part, as an ambassador of Christ. 'The subject is *took,* not so much to speak against impenitence, as to remove it. Where shall I begin? I begin with my own heart—I begin with the ministers of Christ. O that God would help such of us as profess to be ministers of Christ, to be penitent!' He addresses the impenitent sinners. 'We have but a moment to speak. May God help me to speak to the heart. You *must* repent. Away with your morality! Away with all your self-righteousness! To-day hear his voice! And O that streams of salvation might flow to your souls!'

They sing:

"*Fly, ye awakend sinners, fly!*"

The Moderator speaks: 'My dear friends, we are about to close. One request only I have now to make, which is, that we spend a few minutes in *silent prayer;* and that so many as consistently can, will kneel.' A part of the congregation kneeled. After about threee minutes silence, Rev. J. P. the Pastor, broke the silence with a short audible prayer, when all arose, a doxology was sung, a benediction pronounced, and the meeting adjourned *sine die.*

I know not how others felt; but for myself, during all these exercises, I "*enjoyed a very cold time.*" On my arrival in town my first call was on the above named Rev. Pastor, with whom I then left a

small package of books, among which were a New Testament, some Debates, &c. I had superscribed them with his name, hoping that he might, during my stay, open and conclude to take them; but, on calling this morning, I found them unopened. I mentioned it to Mrs. P. and left a request that his Reverence would just look at them. At 2 o'clock I called again. The package had been opened and hastily tied up again. He had *looked* at them; and now looking at me with an—indescribable look, 'he wondered what it meant!' I soon explained the matter. "Well," said he, "I have no money to pay for them, and no time to read them. But, are you not afraid of being *suspected*, having such books with you?" "No, indeed," I replied, and began to give my reasons; but was interrupted with the remark, 'He thought probably he might be *amused* with the bickerings of Campbell and Owen: but he had neither time nor money' [for such amusements!!!]

*Extract of a letter to Traveller, dated W—, July 6th,* 1830.

*Dear Brother,*

I have not forgotten your request, though I have neglected until I fear it is too late. The neglect has not been owing to any want of attachment, or warmth of brotherly feeling, but to a crowd of business, which has seemed to devolve upon me about this time. Last week I was called off three days on a council which was occasioned by Campbellism. Yesterday I had an address to deliver in this village at the celebration of our Sabbath Schools in this region—and another at the meeting of the Temperate Society. But I will not detain you longer with the rehearsal of my business. But a word in relation to our council. We found Campbellism to embrace the following errors:

1st. Faith is no more than a simple assent of the judgment to the truth of the christian religion.

2d. The heart is renewed in the act of baptism, "Go cleanse the room, sweeping it—cultivate the field, ploughing it. Go disciple all nations, baptizing them."

3d. All written articles, covenants, creeds, are discarded, as well as all the missionary operations of the day.

We also found a strong propensity in those who had embraced these sentiments to conceal them, and keep themselves in disguise. But after a long and close examination, the council advised the church to withdraw the hand of fellowship unless they could be reclaimed.—But you, probably, by this time, are better informed on this subject than I, as you are travelling in Campbell's parish.

Please give me a little sketch of your Journal since we parted, and do not fail of returning this way. K.

*Traveller's Reply.*

*Dear Brother K,*

Your very welcome letter was not received by me till after I left M—. It subsequently came, enclosed in one from my brother at that place. You say, "Please give me a little sketch of your Journal," &c. Well, here you have it.

"*H—, June 18th.* At 4 o'clock fulfilled my appointment, and preached on death—the cause—the sting—the power of the grave—and the victory obtained by our Lord Jesus Christ. Present, a very respectable number of different persuasions; and among them Rev. L. L. S. a Universalist teacher, and Rev. G. W. D. Baptist, agent for the American Bible Society. Brother D. made some remarks commending my discourse, and concluded with the subject of his agency. Old Mr. Hanks, a Baptist brother, then got up and gave his testimony to the truth and importance of what we both said. Brother D. prayed after which, such as were favorable to his object and agency, were requested to remain to see what could be done in this place..... Took tea with A. P. Esq. Mr. S. now made *his* remarks—said, that from the last reports of the American Bible Society, it appeared it had cost the benevolent public about $8 for every copy of the Bible which they had gratuitously bestowed.....

"*June 19th.* In taking leave of my friends at H. the following dialogue occurred with one of them, a Mrs. G. a Universalist:—

*Mrs. G.* Well, I understand you are going on to Ohio.

*Traveller.* Yes, Ma'am.

*Mrs. G.* To preach, I suppose?

*Traveller.* Yes, I shall probably preach some.

*Mrs. G.* Lordy massy! if you can't preach any better than you did yesterday, I think you'd better turn about and go back to the East and go to work—I think you've mistook your arrant.

*Traveller.* Ah, well—perhaps I had. But why do you think I have mistaken my errand?

*Mrs. G.* Why, you made such work on't telling your story. When I go to meeting I want to learn something—if I can't hear something new, I'd rather stay at home by all odds.

*Traveller.* I had calculated to make you a longer visit—should be glad to do so now; but think I must go. Good bye.

*Mrs. G.* Good bye. I wish you well.

"*Lord's day, June 20th.* Delivered two discourses in the Baptist meeting house at B. Rainy day, and not more than 30 or 40 out, either in the forenoon or afternoon. The church in this place consiss of 39 members. The society is small—their meeting house is built of brick, and cost $6700, for which they are now about $5000 in debt. Besides the Baptist's, there is one Presbyterian, one Episcopalian, and a Methodist church here—all of which have meeting houses. The population is estimated at about 8000, one-sixth only of which attend public worship on Lord's day. Dead, dead! twice dead and plucked up by the roots! Slept at brother C—'s. Miss C. a member of the Presbyterian church, wondered how any could be sprinkled, when they might have the privilege of being immersed—said she had thought much of washing off her sprinkling in this way.

"*June 21st.* Read two hours in the visions of Swedenborg on Heaven and Hell; and a sketch of his life. Dined at brother C—'s. I returned here from H. on Saturday, and preached yesterday, at the particular request of brother C. who, with the concurrence of brothers L. and W. as I understood it, promised me the use of a horse to attend the U. C. Baptist Association; but whether from my preaching yes-

terday not pleasing, or some other cause, I know not; the promise seems not to be remembered—no horse is provided—none can now be expected. Neither brother L. nor W. have once asked me to call on them.

"*June 22d.* Bade and received a cold good bye at brother C—'s, and at 9 oclock A. M. took my leave."

The preceding is but a morsel of what I might give you *viva voce*, could I but see you; but enough, I presume, for my letter.

Now, in reference to "*Campbellism.*"—I had heard the sound thereof in New England—had possessed myself of, and carefully read, all the works of Alexander Campbell which I could procure. I had, before I left college, renounced all allegiance to creeds and confessions of faith of human fabrication; and when I was ordained, acknowledged no other than the Bible. I had read the New Testament once through, at least, without spectacles; or in other words, without any human system to bias me. I had become convinced that all our holy religion was based upon facts—and faith upon testimony. I had discovered in immersion something more than I at first saw to be in it, viz. a *pledge* of pardon for all past transgressions. I had become very much shaken on the lawfulness and expediency of most of the prevailing popular religious institutions—..... and what shall I say more?—What, on these data, will you now call me? A *Campbellite?* I hope not. No, I am no Campbellite. I hope you will never so call me—that you will still regard me as a disciple of Christ, a brother: and yet, *mirabile dictu!* I did not find in the Western Country a greater Campbellite than myself! None who had read his writings more, or who entertained for him sentiments of higher respect.—While I believe there is no man who has made, and is now making, greater sacrifices for the cause of truth—none more benevolently than Alexander Campbell—none to whom as Baptists and as Christians we are more indebted;—I will not call him *master*, nor be called by *his name*. I had the privilege of spending several days at his house, of forming a very pleasing personal acquaintance with him, of hearing him proclaim the ancient gospel, and of seeing him immerse *ten* persons for the remission of their sins. I was introduced also to *Walter Scott*, to *Sidney Rigdon*, to *Adamson Bentley;* which three ministers have immersed, within three years, at least *three thousand* persons. I have been introduced also to many of these, and they are no Campbellites either. They are characterized, the most of any people that I ever saw, for searching the Scriptures, and for christian affection.

You will receive from A. C. by my naming you, the Millennial Harbinger Extra, *on Remission of Sins.* After reading it carefully, and informing yourself more of *this way*, I should be happy to hear from you again.

FRANCIS.

## CALUMNY DETECTED.

I ONLY premise that I hope the brother who writes this is mistaken as to the writer of the piece examined. I formed so good an opinion of the publisher as well as the editor of the *Herald*, that I am unwilling to think him to be the author of such a base calumny.—*Ed. M. H.*

ESSEX, Va, September 6th, 1830.

*Brother Campbell,*

*Dear Sir*—It is well known in old Virginia, that after I read the *Christian Baptist*, (so far as it had appeared before the public,) I renounced the antichristian and corrupt systems of sectarianism. This drew down the wrath of some of the priests and elders upon me, and they spared no means that our laws would not lay hold of them for using, to destroy my usefulness. Since which time I have the pleasure of saying there are now a number of New Testament disciples that have *moral courage* enough openly and publicly to advocate the restoration of the ancient apostolic gospel. This, sir, it appears, has excited the wrath of some scribe in the *Religious Herald* of the 27th of August. I cannot believe the editor of that paper would be guilty of so shameful a misrepresentation of truth. I have too high an opinion of his character as a man, as a christian, and as a christian teacher. I am constrained to believe it is from the pen of the publisher, and am truly sorry that he is guilty of such antichristian conduct. I might with propriety here adopt the warning voice of *Christianos*, when he threw his *glow worm*, last April, into the Herald—"*Take Heed!*"

I will take an extract from this writer and prove him guilty of perverting the truth, (I had like to have said guilty of wilful slander;) but I will leave that to the judgment of your readers. These are his words: "The christian has one plain straight-forward course given in the Scriptures to do all the good he can, by all the means in his power, while here on earth. It is a singular phenomena in the human mind, that the Antinomian, who relies altogether on experience, and the followers of Mr. Campbell, who deride it, should be alike opposed to Missionary and Bible Societies. It serves to confirm the maxim that extremes in any system are always unsafe. We always have been under the impression that this opposition was also the offspring of a proud, pharisaical, selfish spirit. It reminds us of the observation of a friend to an individual of this class, to whom he remarked, that "really, from his conduct, he could not help believing that he was afraid of having too much company in heaven, or that too many sinners should be saved."

How appropriate is the language of the Apostle: "Thou, therefore, who teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou who preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?" Let us see if I cannot convict him of *robbing* the New Testament disciples of their character. He says we are "your followers." This is enough, he thinks, to render them the victims of his intolerant, bigoted, persecuting tools, and then cries out against the sheep of Christ, Wolf! Wolf! I would ask this scribe, of whom is he and the Baptist churches, in their corporate

capacity, followers? Not of Jesus Christ or his Apostles. Let him attempt to prove this if he dare, and give me equal columns in his paper, and if I do not prove that they have departed from "the unity of the faith" in building up a sect, I will then acknowledge he is right and I am wrong, and will beg his Baptist brethren to receive me into full fellowship with them. The terms are easy. He has types, lampblack, paper, and readers. If he will not condescend to sustain himself and them, (I do not mean as christians, but as the church of Christ,) let him cease to misrepresent the views and conduct of the New Testament disciples. This is "one plain straightforward course." He says we "deride experience," but does not say what kind of experience we deride, whether it is the experience of Mahometans, Papists, Arabs, an idolator's, enthusiast's, a christian's, or this man's, who undertakes to publish the *Religious Herald*, and makes this No. a vehicle of palpable misrepresentation of the truth. I believe he means a christian's experience; if so, he has not spoken the truth. How did he come by this information? He is not omniscient; that he should know the views and characters of those that think with you throughout these United States. He must, therefore, have drawn his conclusions from your writings. I must now ask him, where is the sentence that we have derided *christian* experience? I answer, I have never seen it; but I will prove this charge false. I invite the reader to open the fourth volume of the Christian Baptist, pages 159 and 246, under the head of "*Experimental Religion*;" then take up the Millennial Harbinger, No. 6, page 259, and then say whether or not I have convicted this scribe of a palpable misrepresentation of the truth. But possibly he means something else beside our personal proof in immersion, good works, our holy lives, and godly conversation, is christian experience. Pray what is it? The ebullitions of a disobedient and rebellious heart against God and the words of his grace? or does he mean the conceits, whims, impulses, dreams, fancies, or feelings of those who never were "born of water and of the Spirit?" I am inclined to think the last is what he means by "christian experience?" Is this the "*one plain straight-forward course given in the Scriptures?*" What good can be obtained by calling these things "christian experience?" I answer, none; but much evil. Let us examine this matter. Does not the Baptist church keep every man and woman out of the kingdom of God who will not give in this his "christian experience," no matter what his *faith* and *conduct* may be? Do they not thereby make sects, mental and speculative professors—intolerant, bigoted, and persecuting characters—prayerless members and rebellious professors? Is not such language calculated to make men disobey the institutions of Jesus Christ, by inducing them to believe they are christians when they are not? Let the present state of society answer these questions.

He says we "are opposed to missionary societies." There is as much truth in this as there is in our "deriding experience." Let us examine it. I would ask this scribe, if a Roman Catholic priest was to pass through the city of Richmond on a missionary tour, and apply

to him and his brethren to aid him in *his* cause, and they were to refuse, and this priest was to go off and publish in his Religious Herald that they were opposed to missionary societies, whether they spoke the truth or not? Now, sir, for the very same reasons that he refuses to aid a Roman Catholic priest, we refuse to aid a sectarian priest. The one corrupts the word of God, and the other does the same by making a breach of the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," by their traditions, and teaching men that they can go to heaven without obedience to the institutions of Jesus Christ. But this is not my strongest proof. Now it is well known to this writer that one who wrote from Pittsburg to the editor of the Columbian Star, with about as much truth as he has done, blamed the New Testament disciples for employing Walter Scott and others to proclaim the ancient apostolic gospel, and to oppose the sectarian systems. It is also well known that you have repeatedly hinted to *christians* the necessity of being liberal, and proposed that those who have been accustomed to "the horse-mill plan" of going round once-a-month to churches, should extend their labors, and let some qualified member of the church be appointed in their stead. But, sir, what good can these missionaries do until a foundation is laid for keeping the "unity of the faith"—this of extending their labors over such a large tract of country to convert the nations, when they themselves stand as much in need of being converted to the ancient apostolic gospel as the heathen do, to *their systems of religion;* nay more? This course of conduct reminds me of some farmers I have seen. They are for sowing or planting a large crop of corn, immense fields, more than they can cultivate. The corn springs up, but is overrun with weeds and grass; it may tassel, but no corn is to be seen. Now I ask, which is the wiser and more useful plan—to cultivate as much as we can bring to perfection, or scatter our seed over the soil and leave it to be overrun by thorns and thistles?

He also accuses us of being opposed to Bible Societies. Here again he has departed from the truth. I will question him: Is it "one plain straight-forward course given us in the Scriptures" to form a distinct society from the church to propagate the christian religion? Where is the example or precept recorded in the New Testament authorising combinations of *christians* and infidels to convert the world? I ask, is there not in a great many of the Bible Societies, Presidents, Secretaries, Treasurers, Clerks, and Directors, men who pay no more regard to the person and character of Jesus Christ or his institutions, than if he was an impostor, and the gospel a mere fable? This Herald has not long since said, that one christian, by his disorderly conduct, (or something to that amount,) injured the cause of God more than all the infidel writers. Here we agree. Now I will ask him, when a a member of the Bible Society, that is a wicked man or sectarian, presents a Bible to an unbeliever, if he does not lead this unbeliever to believe that this blessed book is of very little importance, or he would himself first obey its precepts and then recommend it to others? Now, sir, I do know some honest infidels who have refused to join a

Bible Society, believing it would be hypocrisy in them to circulate their money, and lend their influence, in recommending what they had not themselves rightly understood or obeyed—I ask, would this writer himself encourage a man who proclaimed nothing but the truth, and yet lived a wicked life. In vain are all their attempts to save the world, until all who profess the christian religion come into the "unity of the faith." But I must prove this is as false as the other charges. Now, sir, I was a member of the Essex Bible Society from its commencement; but on reflection I found such a heterogeneous mass combined, I resolved to take no active part in it. But knowing that the friends of the present order of things, like this scribe, would accuse without evidence, and condemn without hearing; on examination I placed in the hands of one of the collectors a sufficient sum to constitute me a life member, this was done to prevent what this scribe has accused me of. But this is not all. Sometime past I was in a Bible Society where there was only one man, and he a believer, but what was composed of Baptists. I was invited to become a member, and did so. Thus, sir, I have convicted this scribe of three aberations from the truth. He talks of our being like the Antinomians. When I discovered he was willing his *Presbyterian brethren* should denounce his North Carolina Baptist brethren because they were "men of limited influence—mostly, if not altogether, destitute of learning," and had renounced the traditions of the elders, I thought I discovered the hand of Balak inviting Balaam to help him to curse Israel because he could not conquer them.

It is remarkable with what insolence this writer goes on. He charges us with a proud pharisaical spirit. Let us examine the conduct of some of the Baptist sects, and compare their conduct with the Pharisees. Who was it that induced men to believe they could be the children of God, and yet disregard his institutions? I answer, the Pharisees. And who teaches men now this lesson? The Priests, scribes, (printers,) and Elders. Who was it that taught men that the traditions of the Elders must be obeyed, or they could not be saved, or were accursed? The priests, scribes, and elders. And who now teaches that the traditions of the elders must be kept, or they shall not commune with them in their meeting houses, nor preach the gospel? I answer, the priests, scribes, and elders. Who was it that made the word of God of non-effect by their traditions? The priests, scribes, and elders. And who now by their heterogeneous mass of traditions, make the word of God of non-effect? The priests, printers, and elders. Who was it that accused the Lord Jesus and his Apostles, without evidence, and condemned them without understanding them? The priests, scribes, and elders? And who is it now that accuses christians without evidence and condemns them without knowing or understanding them? I answer, the priests, printers, and elders. Who was it that drew the disciples before the Sanhedrim, cast them out of their synagogue, took away the key of knowledge, persecuted the disciples from city to city, forbidding them any more to speak the gospel? The priests, scribes, and elders. Who draws the New Testament disciples

before their church, casts them out of their meeting houses, takes away the mind of the Holy Spirit, persecutes them, and forbids them to teach the people? The priests, scribes, and elders. Lastly he says, or insinuates, we are "afraid of having too much company in heaven, or that too many sinners should be saved." This coming from a proscribing sectarian, is surprising. I ask, if the principal cause of opposition to the New Testament disciples is not owing to their being too willing to bring all men into the kingdom of God that are willing to come? And do not this sect shut out all men who will not succumb to their traditions? Thus, sir, I have proved the assertions of this scribe to be a fabrication of his own—I am sorry to occupy so much room in doing so.

T. M. HENLEY.

## METAPHYSICAL REGENERATION;

OR,

## *FULLERISM EXPOSED*—NO. I.

I. "THE Holy Spirit imparts to the mind a holy susceptibility and relish for the truth, in consequence of which we discern its glory and embrace it."*

Hence it follows "that the human mind can have a holy relish for the truth before it has any perception of it." A greater absurdity we cannot easily conceive. Can a person have a relish or taste for any thing of which he has not a single perception?

"God does not cause the *natural* man to receive spiritual things; but he removes the obstructing film by imparting a spiritual relish for those things." p. 205, 206. What confusion of figure, indicative of still greater confusion of mind, appears in this assertion! Two senses are confounded—*seeing* and *tasting*. The eye is cured, or the *film* removed from the eye by correcting the taste or relish. What philosophy! To cure the eye by improving or correcting the palate, is certainly a new discovery, and worthy of a spiritual optician.

His theological motto is, in fact, the following: "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned by a taste or spiritual relish *for we know not what.*"

The kernel of Fullerism is found in the following words, page 206: "Though holiness is frequently ascribed in the Scriptures to a spiritual perception of the truth; yet that spiritual perception itself, in the first instance, is ascribed to the influence of the Holy Spirit upon THE HEART."

By "*the heart*," Mr. Fuller means the metaphorical use of the word in our own times—viz. the will and the affections as contradistinguished from the understanding. This is not the *biblical* use of the term as we shall show: therefore, to apply to the heart, as thus defined, all that the Scriptures say about it, is delusive and sophistical in the highest degree. The great Dr. Owen says, "*The heart*, in Scripture, is variously used: sometimes for the *mind* and *understanding*: sometimes for the *will*; sometimes for the *affections*; sometimes for the *conscience*; sometimes for the *whole soul*."† But let the reader

*Appendix to Fuller's Gospel, worthy of all acceptation, p. 204.

†*On Indwelling Sin. chap.* iii.

examine the following Scriptures, and a hundred others referred to in marginal references, and judge for himself: Deut. iv. 39. Psalms xlv. 1. Prov. x. 8. xv. 28. xvi. 9. xix. 21. Eccles. viii. 5. Jer. xxiv. 7. Matth. xiii. 15. Mark ii. 6. 8. Luke x. 19. 35. In these, and many others, the heart is said to be wise, to reason, to consider, to doubt, to meditate, to study, to ponder, to discern, to understand," &c. &c. Judge, then, how great the sophism must be, which applies to the *will* and *affections* all that is said in the Scriptures concerning the *heart!!* The Spirit of God first operates upon the heart, upon the will and the affections, and then upon the understanding, according to Mr. Fuller. The metaphysical regeneration, for which the English and American Fullerites contend, is this: The Spirit of God first operates upon the heart, *i. e.* as defined by Fuller, upon the will and affections, and then upon the understanding. In other words, he makes the soul to love and relish the truth, and then to perceive it!

To open Lydia's heart was, according to him, to open Lydia's affections. "Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures?" This was to open their will and affections!! But not according to this philosophy spake the disciples of Jesus: "Did not our *hearts burn within us* while he *talked* with us, and opened to us the *Scriptures*." To open the Scriptures or the understanding, is the same thing in the Scripture style; but to open the will or the affections belongs to no style save that of Andrew Fuller.

According to Mr. Fuller, "A CHANGE OF HEART MUST OF NECESSITY PRECEDE SPIRITUAL PERCEPTION AND FAITH." This is the darling mystery of metaphysical regeneration. Yes, God *reveals* the truth to us, by changing our hearts *before* we perceive and believe it. The *film* before spoken of, is the perversity of the affections, or obstinacy of the will, which blind the eye of the soul or the understanding of man. To take off the *film* is to destroy the perversity and obstinacy of the heart, and this is done by imparting physically a relish or taste for spiritual things; which impartation of a relish is the regeneration of the Fullerites.

While, then, Messrs. Brantly and a few others are endeavoring, from their high standing for orthodoxy, to infuse into public opinion a peculiar contempt for the apostolic regeneration, as defined in our *Extra, No.* 1, and availing themselves of popular prejudice, stigmatizing it by such epithets as "*baptismal regeneration?*" we shall attempt to make the public understand their *metaphysical regeneration*, as taught by their master, *Fuller*.

I venture to predict that Messrs. Brantly, Clopton, & Co. will be as little disposed, after a few essays shall have appeared on their metaphysical regeneration, to defend it, either from Scripture or reason, as they are now to attack the scriptural regeneration, on either scriptural or rational premises.

The reader will perceive from the extracts given, and from many passages of a similar stamp in Mr. Fuller's writings, that, with him, *regeneration* is the infusion into the mind of a spiritual relish, for the

truth of which the person is supposed to be at the time totally ignorant. If I do injustice to Mr. Fuller, (for which I have not a single wish or design,) some of his warm advocates will, we hope, appear in his defence. Before my second essay on this subject appears, it would be well for the reader to ascertain, if he can, from any source, whether a person can be said to be regenerated, or born again, by the infusion or impartation of a relish or taste for any thing; or whether the receiving of such a relish could, with any regard to human language or analogy, be called *regeneration.*

EDITOR.

## THE ANATHEMA OF EBENEZER ROGERS OF MISSOURI.

I SEE in the last "*Chronicle*," that Ebenezer Rogers of Missouri, has "waxed exceeding wroth" against me on account of my Review of his Circular. The spirit of orthodoxy breathes threatenings and slaughter in this metaphysically regenerated defender of the faith. He is now many degrees above the reasoning point. Should he cool down to the temperature of calm reason, his speculations or excerps from Fuller might be further shown to be morsels of mystery stolen from the recondite visions, from the inner temples of an empty and deceitful philosophy—after the traditions of men—after the rudiments of the world—and not after Christ. At present this would be a hopeless effort as to him. For he cannot see that if the foundation of any system be destroyed, it matters not to pull every stone apart; and therefore complains that I "skipped over some sentences" in his essay—such as, "And do you really and sincerely believe, Mr. C. that it is one of the monstrous abortions of a purblind theology, for any human being TO BE WISHING for supernatural aid to be born again?" My not answering such a question, and not noticing some equally impertinent sentences, he would make the folks believe was because they were too hard for me!! To say nothing of the insulting air of such a question, its irrelevancy to the points at isssue was sufficient reason for paying no attention to it—I say, the insulting air; for I had declared before that such was my conviction. To ask me if I sincerely believed what I had before published as my own conviction, was placing me in the predicament of some of Mr. Rogers' friends, who preach and assert the opinions of others, without any assurance that they are true; or of these who say what they do not think. My not answering this question—or, in other words, my not saying that I believed what I had written, is the occasion of the following malediction, or anathema:—

"The last quotation," [the above question] says Mr. Rogers, "is an *everlasting monument*, bearing the following inscription, *'that Mr. Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Brooke county, Virginia, does really and sincerely believe that it is one of the monstrous abortions of purblind theology, for any human being* TO BE WISHING *for* SUPERNATURAL *aid to be born again.* Poor man! unless the supernatural aid of the Spirit of God should be exercised in regenerating his soul, he will

(with millions of others) have one day to stand before the burning tribunal of the Great Judge, with blackness in his countenance, trembling in his limbs, convulsion in his conscience, and his voice will be heard, saying, Oh! rocks and mountains *fall* on me, and hide me from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb!"

May I request the reader, courteous or uncourteous, to ponder well the above terrific denunciation. From whom does it come? From E. Rogers of Missouri, a man who affords no evidence that he understands the import of the sentence which he calls the "*everlasting monument.*" But whether or not, mark the spirit of Fullerism in this militant son of Calvinism. This is the spirit which he has received. I am judged and condemned by Ebenezer Rogers as destitute of any principle, or work, or change of heart, state, or character, which can save me from everlasting death, unless I shall hereafter become regenerated according to Mr. Rogers' metaphysical regeneration, which he has daringly called the supernatural aid of the Spirit of God!!! Yes, I am, in my present state, represented, and doomed, in his judgment, to stand before the "*burning* tribunal of the Great Judge," with all "blackness, trembling, and convulsion," because I have called his notions of regeneration a metaphysical whim. Who of all the Popes was a greater Pope than this humble Baptist, who complains of hands blistered with the sickle?

Poor man that I am! Neither faith, nor baptism, nor the works of christian faith and love, nor the grace of God, nor the blood of Christ, can save me from this sentence of *Ebenezer Rogers!* I am wanting, damnably deficient of every saving grace and benefit, because I call Fullerism, as retailed by Ebenezer Rogers, "purblind theology." I will not apply the old adage to this good man: "He that angrily predicts evil to any man, wishes for the evil which he predicts." No, I will permit him henceforth to blaspheme me without notice, without reply, unless he should be restored to such a temperament as is favorable to conviction.

A word to the thoughtful before we close our remarks upon this denunciation:—You must perceive that, according to the metaphysically regenerated, (the votaries of Fullerism,) if a man be not regenerated in their way, his faith, and the *obedience of faith*, and every thing else called christian, leaves him an heir of "eternal blackness, trembling, and convulsion." And that as no man can, on their theory, superinduce this supernatural aid, many will be eternally damned because of the want of supernatural aid, which they could not possibly obtain, because the Spirit did not operate physically upon their hearts as it did upon the heart of Ebenezer Rogers of Missouri! And yet that the Spirit of God has mediately or immediately operated upon the heart of Ebenezer Rogers any more than upon his brethren Lawrence Greatrake and John Winter, with me, at least, is not so absolutely certain as to exclude all doubt.

EDITOR.

## PROPHECIES—*No. III.*

Proposition 2. "*After the Jews shall have been restored to their own land, and shall have resettled it, the nations of the earth shall combine to despoil them of their treasures, and to subjugate them to their sway.*"

IN our last essay we summoned the Prophets to attest our first proposition. Hosea, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Haggai, delivered a part of their testimony, which conspired to show that Israel and Judah should yet be gathered *out of all lands* and restored to the land of Canaan, and that this should happen before they are converted to christianity. Before we farther expatiate on the testimonies delivered in our last, we shall hear a few depositions in confirmation of our second proposition.

Some common or general head, denominated *Gog*, is to be the generalissimo of the combination against Israel and Judah when restored to their own land in the latter days. We shall not now inquire whether the Grand Turk be the *Gog* of Ezekiel. It is enough for our present purpose that a general alliance against the restored Jews, such a war against them as never yet happened since God called Abraham, is foretold in the following oracles:—

"Again a word of the Lord came to me, saying, Son of man, set thy face against Gog, and the land of Magog, the prince of Ros, Mesoch and Thobel and prophesy against him and say to him,

Thus saith the Lord, Lord, Behold I am against thee, prince of Ros, Mesoch and Thobel. And I will gather thee and thine army, horses and horsemen all clad with coats of mail—a great assembly with shields and helmets and swords, Persians and Ethiopians and Lybians, all armed with helmets and shields; Gomer and all those around him, the house of Thogarmar, from the extreme north, with all around him and many nations with thee. Be prepared and make thyself ready, thou and thy multitude assembled with thee; for thou shalt be to me for a vanguard. After many days he will be in a state of preparation, and in the last of years he will begin his march, and come into the land which is withdrawn from the sword—the land of them who have been collected from many nations, to the land of Israel, which had been made an entire desert. When he from nations hath begun his march, they will be all dwelling in peace. Then thou wilt come up like rain, and advance like a cloud to cover the land. When thou shalt be with all thy bands around thee, and many nations with thee; (Thus saith the Lord, Lord,) In that day things will come into thy heart, and thou wilt form wicked devices and say, "I will go up against an abject land: I shall come upon them who are living at ease, and dwelling in peaceful security—all inhabiting a land in which there is not a walled town, and who have neither bars nor gates; to take prey and to gather their spoils, by turning my hand against this wasted country which is re-settled, and against a nation gathered together from many nations who have gotten wealth and inhabit the navel of the earth."——

Prophesy Son of man and say to Gog, Thus saith the Lord, At the time when my people Israel shall be dwelling in peace, wilt thou

not be roused? Yes; thou wilt come from thy place, from the extremity of the north: thou and many nations with thee, all mounted on horses, a great assembly, and a mighty army, will indeed come up against my people Israel, as a cloud to cover the land: in the latter days I will bring thee up against my land, that all the nations may know me when I am hallowed by thee in their sight.

Thus saith the Lord, Lord, to Gog, Thou art he of whom I have spoken in former times, by the ministry of my servants the prophets of Israel, that in these days and years I would bring thee up against them. But it shall come to pass on that day, on the day when Gog shall come against the land of Israel, my wrath shall come up, saith the Lord, Lord, and my zeal. In the fire of mine indignation, I have spoken, there shall indeed be on that day a great shock in the land of Israel. At the presence of the Lord, the fishes of the sea shall be shaken, and the birds of the air, and the beasts of the field, and all the reptiles which creep on the earth, and all the men on the face of the earth. And the mountains shall be rent to pieces, and the vallies shall sink down, and every wall shall fall to the ground. And for all this indeed I will call up terror saith the Lord: every man's sword shall be against his brother. And I will execute judgment on him, with pestilence and blood and with tempests of rain and hailstones; and I will rain down fire and brimstone on him, and on all with him, even on the many nations with him. And I shall be magnified and hallowed and glorified; and made known in the sight of many nations, and they shall know that I am the Lord.

Thou therefore Son of man, prophesy against Gog and say, Thus saith the Lord, Lord, Behold I am against thee, Gog, the prince of Ros, Mesoch and Thobel, and I will assemble thee and lead thee and cause thee to come from the farthest north, and bring thee up to the mountains of Israel; and I will destroy thy bow from thy left hand and thine arrows from thy right; and overthrow thee on the mountains of Israel; and thou and all who are arouud thee shall fall; and the nations with thee shall be given to multitudes of birds, to all the feathered tribe, and to all the wild beasts of the field I have given thee to be devoured. On the open field thou shalt fall; for I have spoken, saith the Lord. I will indeed send a fire against Gog and the isles shall be peaceably inhabited, and they shall know that I am the Lord. And my holy name shall be known in the midst of my people Israel; and my name which is holy shall no more be profaned; and the nations shall know that I am the Lord, the Holy One of Israel. Behold it is coming and thou shalt know that it will be, saith the Lord, Lord; this is the day of which I have spoken, when they who inhabit the cities of Israel shall come forth, and make fires with the arms—with the shields and spears, and with bows and arrows, and hand-staves and poles—even with these they shall make fires seven years: so that they shall not have occasion to take wood from the plains, nor to cut timber from the forest; but shall burn the arms only. And they shall plunder their plunderers; and spoil those who spoiled them, saith the Lord. And on that day I will give Gog a

noted place—a burying place in Israel, the grave yard of strangers by the sea shore: and the slope of the valley shall be enclosed with a wall; and there Gog and all his multitude shall be buried; and it shall then be called the grave yard of Gog. For the house of Israel will bury them, that the land may be cleansed. During seven months the people of the land will be employed in burying them; and it shall be to them a memorable epoch, "*The day when he was glorified*," saith the Lord. Then they will send men every where to traverse the land, and bury them who are left on the face of the ground, in order to purify it after the seven months. And they will make diligent search. And every one who traverseth the land, upon seeing a human bone, shall set up a mark *near it; till* the buriers bury it at Gai, the grave yard of Gog: (for the name of that city *shall be* called Grave Yard) thus shall the land be cleansed.

Thou, therefore, Son of man, say, Thus saith the Lord, Say to every winged bird, and to all the wild beasts of the field, Assemble and come: assemble from all around to my sacrifice, to the great sacrifice which I have made for you on the mountains of Israel; and you shall eat flesh and drink blood. You shall eat the flesh of giants and drink the blood of the princes of the earth. Rams and young bulls and he goats: and all the bulls are well fatted. And you shall eat fat till you are glutted, and drink blood to satiety, at my sacrifice which I have prepared for you. And you shall be filled at my table with horses and horsemen, and with giants and every great warrior, saith the Lord. I will indeed display my glory among you, and all the nations shall see my judgment which I have executed, and my hand which I have brought upon them. And the house of Israel shall know that I am the Lord their God from this particular time and thence forward. And all the nations shall know, that the house of Israel were carried into captivity for their sins. Because they broke covenant with me therefore I turned away my face from them, and delivered them into the hands of their enemies, and they all fell by the sword. According to their pollutions and according to their iniquities I dealt with them and turned away my face from them. Therefore thus saith the Lord, I will now bring back the captivity of Jacob, and have compassion on the house of Israel. And I will shew a zeal for my holy name, when they shall have suffered disgrace, for the rebellion of which they were guilty, when they dealt peaceably in their own land. And there shall be none to make them afraid, when I have brought them back from among the nations and gathered them from the countries of the nations. So I shall be hallowed by them in the sight of the nations and they shall know that I the Lord am their God, when I manifest myself to them among the nations. And I will no more turn away my face from them, for as much as I have poured out my wrath on the house of Israel, saith the Lord, Lord."—*Ezekiel* xxxix.

I have given the whole of this remarkable prediction in the version from the Septuagint, by *Charles Thomson*, Esq. not doubting but it will appear in bolder relief to the intelligent reader, than the common

version; and, from its superior plainness, will render comment less necessary. After reading this prediction the reader has only to notice a few points:—

1. That this prophecy has never yet been accomplished requires not much proof. That the ten tribes called *Israel*, have not yet been restored, all confess; that such an army as described here ever assembled against the Jews in the land of Canaan, history avers not. No event has transpired since the Babylonish Captivity to which these declarations can, on any principle of interpretation, be applied. This prophecy is not, therefore, yet fulfilled.

2. The ten tribes, and the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, must be assembled in that land long deserted, before the prediction can be fulfilled. That they are to return in an unconverted state has already been proved.

4. They are to return with considerable wealth, to rebuild their cities and towns, and to become an object worthy to excite the cupidity and ambition of the neighboring nations. Feeling themselves secure through the good will of the nations which gave them their land, they will not think of building walls and bulwarks around their towns and cities, and will become, in the estimation of these allied nations, an easy prey to them.

4. These events are said to be far distant from the times of Ezekiel; they are said to occur in "*the latter days*;" and therefore could not apply to the restoration of the Jews from the land of the Chaldeans. Besides, as has been alleged, no such an assemblage ever came against the Jews—no such havoc of human life, in any confederation against them, has ever occurred.

5. But that which is most worthy of observation in this prophecy, as introductory to our third proposition, is, that at the time when this army of nations shall have made their onset on congregated Israel and Judah, and when the people of the Covenant shall be sorely pressed and ready to despair; then, at this crisis, there shall be a great shock, or earthquake, in the land of Israel. The birds, beasts, and fishes shall feel it; the whole race of men shall feel it; mountains shall be rent to pieces, vallies shall shake and sink down, and all the walled towns shall fall to the ground.

This earthquake will be accompanied with tempests of rain, hail-stones, fire, and brimstone, which shall fall with fierce indignation upon the nations assembled against Israel and Judah. Then shall the Lord appear in behalf of Israel, and their vanquished enemies shall leave their carcases and their weapons on the fields of Canaan. Such a slaughter was never seen before. The weapons of the vanquished shall, in that mild climate, afford fuel to the remnant of Israel for a week of years. This is the epoch which, in after times, shall be designated as "*The day when the Lord was glorified*"—the day when Israel was converted, and the Gentiles turned from their idols, and all nations filled with the glory of the Lord.

Concerning this earthquake, its concomitants, and effects, we will speak hereafter. In the mean time, our second proposition is, we

apprehend, established and so far illustrated as is necessary to this part of our developement. Each proposition shall be more fully confirmed and illustrated as we proceed in this examination; for we have in view the rhetorician's rule, which prescribes that in every good oration and essay, every new proposition and argument must not only sustain itself, but should also reflect additional light upon the preceding, as well as prepare the way for those which are to follow. He that invades an enemy's country, and who dares not secure the strong holds which he has taken, fights to no purpose in attempting farther to extend his conquests. DANIEL.

## MR. BRANTLY AND THE EXTRA No. I.

MR. BRANTLY has been so condescending as to impugn the doctrine of remission, as exhibited in the Essay on Christian Immersion, without formally questioning the truth of one of the twelve propositions. He has not joined issue upon any one position. With his usual art of evasion, air of contempt, and appeal to popular prejudice, he looks askance at the "*Brooke County Creed*," as he contemptuously calls Peter's proclamation to the Pentecostian penitents. Yes, he nicknames the apostolic gospel "the Brooke County Neologism, or New Doctrine," "the old Paidobaptist sentiment," "the vamped up ancient heresy, from Justin Martyr to William Wall."

Mr. Brantly has learned the difference between argument and calumny; between demonstration and detraction; between nicknaming and refuting; between a scoff and a reason. It is much more easy to cry out *heresy!* than to prove an error. But he has the vantage ground; and a few opprobrious appellations from *Philadelphia* will go much farther than as many arguments from *Brooke County*. He is a *metropolitan*, and he sets it down as insolence not to be pardoned, for a person in *Brooke County* to dissent from a Rabbi in *Philadelphia*, who preaches from a velvet cushion to the fashionable circles in a commercial city. What a pity it is for the claims of such high-minded aspirants after human praise, that the Saviour of the world did not choose to be born in a wealthy and polite city! that he was not rocked in a gilded cradle, and ministered to by metropolitans! What a pity for the admirers of stately steeples, splendid edifices, lofty pulpits, and crimson cushions, that Jesus the Lord of glory proclaimed his introductory discourse, the admiration of the world, upon *a hill*, and not in *a city!* that he chose Galilean *fishermen* in preference to such learned and fashionable *cits* as Parson Brantly, Editor of the Columbian Star!

If the circumstance of breathing in a city has such advantages; if wisdom, knowledge, and goodness, be the elements of a city atmosphere, what a pity that not one of the original Twelve, nor of all God's reformer's, was called out of the smoke of a city to enlighten the world! In Mr. Brantly's Testament it should read, "Thou hast hid the secrets of thy reign from the humble and the babes, and revealed

them to the sages and the learned; nay, rather to those who *live in a city*, whether sages or learned."

But now let us see how the metropolitan Rabbi manages *"the Brooke County Reformer."* His first quotation is from the cover of the *Extra*. Here he artfully takes the five first periods to infuse into his readers the belief that the sentiment or argument in the Essay was not matured; but the hasty and undigested views of one who had not leisure to examine accurately. If he had added only one period more (a line and a half) his remarks and insinuations would have appeared ridiculous. But without that sentence, *designedly suppressed*, the *text* suited his sermon—I say *designedly* suppressed; for no person who reads the apology on the cover, and his remarks, can form any other opinion.

His second extract is the proposition on page 7, with the *three* subsequent paragraphs. The proposition he does not impugn; but we shall give our readers all his remarks upon it:—

"REMARKS —*Here we perceive that religion is not* "a character," *but* "a state," *and that the only transforming power which it exerts over mankind, is derived from this external state. Men are brought into* this state, *or* condition, *without any previous change in the character of their hearts and minds, through the medium of* immersion in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; *and then finding themselves in this state, they begin to conform to its new relations, and thus grow religious. Surely this is a most convenient religion: it saves much trouble. A man has only to get up and walk into the new* state, *and he is then* pardoned, justified, and ADOPTED. *He is spared the pain of penitence, the unseemliness of tears, the contrition of sorrow, and all the mortification of his past sins. Instead of going with his heart and soul into the christian state, he has only to make use of his feet and hands. He adopts religion as the Roman Senators adopted an opinion* —"Ire pedibus in sententiam," *to go on their feet into an opinion—was the mode of voting with them. In the same manner must those act, who confer their suffrage upon Mr. Campbell's creed. They have only to cross the Ohio, and then they are out of one state—and in another. This is the very simile which that gentleman employs to represent the transition employed in regeneration. But let us proceed with the Brooke County Neologism, or New Doctrine."*

I never said nor insinuated that religion was *a state*. No man of sense can affirm that religion is a state. Few men who have lived in a city could commit a greater blunder than Mr. Brantly has here committed. To say that religion is *"a character,"* as he implies, is intolerable in the 19th century. Of a religious character, and of a religious state, I can have some idea; but to say that religion is *"a character,"* or *"a state,"* may pass in Philadelphia, but in Brooke county we consider ourselves at least three centuries in advance of such a phraseology.

But to excite the disgust of the children of the clergy a new proposition is framed for me in the words following, to wit: "The only transforming power which it (religion—that is, *"character"*) exerts over

mankind, is derived from this external state." The term *external* is Mr. Brantly's addition for the reason aforesaid. To show (if any person at first glance does not see) the absurdity of Mr. Brantlys religion, viz. "a character," we shall substitute the definition for the term defined, and see how it reads: "The only transforming power which "a character" (*i. e.* religion) exerts over mankind is derived from a character"!!

Because I represented the words "*pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved*, as terms expressive not of "*character*," but "*state*," Mr. Brantly will make a definition for me and for himself. With him religion is *a character*, and with me he will have it *a state*. This is rabbinical and Philadelphian enough for our taste. The people of Brooke county have no attribute of character which they call pardoned, adopted, &c. But it seems among the recent importations in Philadelphia they have got a new assortment of characters—pardoned and justified characters. I should like to know the virtue which is designated by pardoned. But we are so far back in the woods, that we must wait till the Philadelphians send us a definition.

His second period is as gross a calumny as was ever penned:—"Men are brought into this state, or condition, without any previous change in the character of their hearts and minds, through the medium of immersion." *O Tempora! O Mores!* If this be the Philadelphia morality, we want none of it in Brooke. There never was such an idea expressed by me; nay, the contrary every where appears in the Essay and in all my writings. I contend that a change of heart, resulting from faith, is necessary to give to immersion any efficacy in changing the state of any person whatever. Every other remark made upon this position is baseless when I affirm, that it is a proposition of Mr. Brantly's, put into my mouth. He might as justly have told his readers that I had changed the words of Jesus from "he that *believes* and is baptized shall be saved," into "*he that is baptized shall be saved.*" If such be the *morality* of the Philadelphia clergy, what must be the regard for truth among the laity! That I do no injustice to Mr. Brantly I appeal to the extracts and his remarks upon them, and I only ask every candid man to compare the text with the sermon.

His next extract includes the 7th proposition, and the three next paragraphs, with a part of the fourth. If he had given *the whole of the fourth*, his remarks upon this proposition would have appeared to all, disingenuous and impertinent. But as it is, we shall give all his remarks upon it:—

"Remarks.—Here we are told that the "*change of heart*" spoken of in the proposition, "*is the result of a change of views.*" We had always thought that a change of heart in a sinner was the result of the Holy Spirit's acting in conjunction with the Word of God; but it seems we have been in error, and have led others into error; since it now appears that a man has only to change his views, and the change of heart follows as a matter of course. The similes here adduced, prove that our construction of Mr. Campbell's doctrine is correct. Lavinia

has only to change her views, and to pass from the state of servitude to that of connubial equality, and she is then in a condition to which poor Maria cannot attain, although her change of feelings and views are as great as that of Lavinia. But we must draw particular attention to the closing sentence of the preceding extract. This sentence contains the marrow of all the foregoing divinity. It is the essence of the whole composition. A man may have his heart changed, in Mr. Campbell's acceptation of the term, and still remain "*unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost to all christian enjoyment,*" unless he is so fortunate as to obtain *immersion*. The ancient Greeks and Romans had a notion that a man, after death, could not be conveyed over the Stygian wave unless he had been *immersed* in earth. For want of the small boon of a little earth upon the body, the soul was destined to roam a hundred years on this side the dark flowing river. Mr. Campbell's philosophy about *immersion* is quite as unrelenting. He can allow no change of heart competent to bring a man into a *pardoned state* This is more than all our Baptist philosophy ever dreamt of. We too love immersion; but if Mr. Campbell is right, we have not loved it half enough. If he be correct in his scheme, we have yet to begin the very rudiments of religion. More favored than ordinary mortals, he has been commissioned to show the world what virtue there is in water. We are now to have a new plantation of christians upon the labor-saving system of water cultivation. Some plants may thrive in this way; but most classes of the vegetable world require a little sunshine, and free air, as well as water. But perhaps, Mr. Campbell, being deeply read in the writings of the early Christians, believes with Tertullian, that water snakes are not so noxious as those which inhabit the arid plains."

One would think that Mr. Brantly does here impugn the 7th proposition: but unless we supposed that his allusion to the Greeks and Romans is logic, and argument, and scripture, we cannot say that he does more than grin at it. He would seem to take the following position, if there be any pertinency in his allusions and grimaces:—'A man may be pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, saved, and alive to all christian enjoyment, *without baptism*.' Of what use, then, is Mr. Brantly's baptism? What a simpleton was Peter, on Mr. B's position, to tell the three thousand *believing penitents* to save themselves from that untoward generation and to be immersed for the remission of their sins. Why did Ananias, by the command of God, immerse the *believing* and *penitent* Saul for remission? Why did the angel tell the *pious* and *prayerful* Cornelius to send for Peter to tell him words by which *he might be saved?* And why did he command him to be immersed after he received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit? These, and a hundred other incidents, only show how far the Saviour and the Galileans differed from the Philadelphia scribe. Mr. B's "water snakes;" "arid plains," and "water cultivation," we refer to him who said when going down into the Jordan, "Thus it becometh us to *honor* every divine institution." I dare not take any other notice of these remarks. To the second

period of these remarks I refer the reader to the first essay on *Metaphysical Regeneration.*

The next extract is *Proposition* 10, with the three following paragraphs, on which Mr. Brantly remarks:—

"With all Mr. Campbell's professions of fairness and truth, we are compelled to convict him in some of the foregoing statements, of an open deviation from fact. He says, "It is conceded by the most learned —— Baptists" that Titus iii. and 5. refers to immersion. Now we freely confess that we never read a Baptist expositor who so referred the passage. Dr. Gill expressly denies that it is to be understood of baptism or immersion. These are his words: "By the former (*that is, the bath of regeneration*) is meant, not the ordinance of water baptism, for that is never expressed by washing; nor is it the cause, or means of regeneration; the cause being the Spirit of God, and the means the word of God. And besides, persons ought to be regenerated before they are baptized; and they may be baptized, and yet not regenerated, as Simon Magus. But regenerating grace is meant, or a being born of the water and of the Spirit; that is, of the grace of the Spirit, comparable to water, for its purity and cleansing virtue." We cannot consider it probable that any Baptist expositor ever yet admitted that the *washing of regeneration* in the above passage, was to be understood of immersion. We call upon Mr. Campbell to name the learned Baptist, *other than himself*, who ever yet so received the verse. He has affirmed that there are learned Baptists who so understand it, and the burden of proof must rest upon him. We have proved that Dr. Gill does not so construe it; and we venture to say, in behalf of Booth and Fuller, that they do not so understand it. That Pædobaptists should claim this Scripture for the support of their views, is no way marvellous. The bath of regeneration, in their vocabulary, means simply baptism; and when administered to infants, in their view, it precedes the renewing of the Holy Ghost. Mr. Campbell avails himself of the learning of Wall to show that during the 400 years which succeeded Christ and his Apostles, all Christian writers, without exception, understood John iii. 5. of water baptism."

That the word *regeneration* in Titus iii. and 5. refers to immersion. I said, was conceded by the most learned Paidobaptists and Baptists This is "an open deviation from fact," says Mr. Brantly, and excepts Mr. Gill as an *expositor*—and the only *expositor* which he does produce, to sustain his "open deviation from fact." For my part, I do not consult Dr. Gill on any question involving a knowledge of the gospel or christian institution. He deals too much in "*may be*" and "*perhaps*" for any person to confide in him. He gives sometimes *three* or more meanings to one of the most literal passages. As for his rabbinical literature, however it may have obtained for him the title of learned, as a sound Greek critic, or interpreter, he ranks not among the second class. But if he did, what is that to this assertion? Mr. Brantly concedes me the *Paidobaptist* literati, and I have shown that I have all the Baptist literati for the first four hundred years, "*not one man excepted.*" If I had said that I had all the learned Baptist com-

mentators and system-makers with me, Mr. Brantly might have produced his Dr. Gill as a pertinent exception. But I might name all the Baptist writers from Barnabas to Albertus Magnus in the 12th century, in proof that every one who alludes to this passage applies it to immersion, and that all use the term *regeneration* in this sense. I proved in my debate with Mr. Walker, that all the christians, learned and unlearned, down till 1311, were *Baptists* as far as immersion is concerned; and concerning all these it is affirmed by the most learned and impartial historian on this subject, that they did "*every man, never* use the words *regeneration*, or *born again*, but they mean baptism." Wall, vol. 1. page 24. To all the writers and commentators till 1311, and they were all Baptists, and to all the learned Paidobaptists for the last three hundred years, who quote or allude to the passage, I appeal. To many of our most learned contemporaries, from Archibald M'Clain's times, in Scotland, down to those yet on the stage, as far as my knowledge extends, I can make the same appeal. Dr. Gill is the only exception known to me. What Booth and Fuller may say on this subject I know not; but Mr. Brantly is the first man I have heard place them among *the learned*.

Mr. Brantly calls Mr. Wall my "learned prompter;" and says that I "avail myself of the learning of Wall to prove that *all christians* understood John iii. and 5. of water baptism." What means this? Was he afraid that I should appear to have examined these matters any farther than Mr. Wall? Or did he think that we must know history by intuition? I have, I think, many years ago, quoted from my own reading, almost all these passages, and many more than are found in the *Extra*. I gave them at this time from Dr. Wall for reasons assigned in the Extra. I again ask, what does he mean by calling Mr. Wall my "learned prompter"? Is not this another proof of the impotency of his logic? Who is *his* learned prompter?

Mr. Brantly makes Grotius, whom he calls an *Arian*, his learned prompter upon Matthew iii. 11. and John iii. 5. The Holy Spirit and fire, is, with him, a "*fiery spirit;*" and born of water and the Spirit, is a "*watery spirit.*" He follows this "metaphysical," and "learned," and "eccentric Arian," as he calls him, in his *watery* and *fiery spirit!!!* Mr. Brantly talks so contemptuously of "*water* baptism," I would suspect him to be turning *Quaker*, were it not for positive assurances that he still edits the Star, and preaches for a salary! His *Arian* friend *Grotius* and he may amuse themselves with a "watery spirit" and a "fiery spirit," or a fire and water spirit; but, for our part, we must follow common sense, grammar, and all antiquity too, in supposing that when Jesus said, "You must be born of water and the Spirit," he did not mean "born of the Spirit and of the Spirit," nor of spiritual water, nor of a "watery spirit"—but of water and the Spirit.

His charge or insinuation that I made Macknight speak on Titus iii. and 5. as I pleased, is perfectly gratuitous, and a violation of the rules of the most common courtesy. Macknight as a *critic*, and Macknight as a *Presbyterian*, are very different characters. As a CRITIC

he positively avers that "the bath of regeneration means baptism." I gave one of his notes, in which there is a full and unequivocal exposition of his views, both theological and critical. And in the quotation added by Mr. Brantly does he not aver that Paul in Titus iii. and 5. follows John iii. and 5. in joining the two together, baptism by water and the Spirit! Mr. Brantly makes a note at the bottom of his page to say that what I had put in brackets was my own, and not Macknight's, as if I had wished it to appear to be Macknight's, and not my own: when my putting it in brackets, and pointing it off, too, by inverted commas, made it as plain as our rules of punctuation could make it. Such implications and insinuations are beneath the dignity of any honorable lawyer, and show the nakedness of the land, and the poverty of mind, or of argument, to say nothing of the morality, of a religious opponent. EDITOR.

## ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITIES IN FAVOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REMISSION, *versus* MR. BRANTLY.

AT one time we are represented as extremely fond of new things, and that we affect a peculiar originality of thought: at another time as the followers of some errorists, as vamping up anew old heresies. Of both these crimes does our *learned metropolitan* accuse us. Now we are willing to avow, that the proclamation of immersion for the remission of sins is a discovery of the Reformers now in the field, and that it was learned by us from the New Testament alone—nay, it forced itself upon us as a conclusion from our own premises. The detection of the foundation of infant sprinkling and of the meaning of christian immersion were both occasioned in the same way. A Presbyterian Doctor of divinity told us *twenty years* ago, that if we followed up our principles they would oblige us to abandon infant sprinkling. We did not then think so. But our efforts to establish infant sprinkling upon our own principles, led us to abandon it as a human institution. Long since that time the same principles led us to the discovery, that christian immersion was designed for what we now proclaim it. The same logic which made us *Baptists*, made us proclaimers of immersion for remission. This is the fact, impugn it who may.

When first awakened to examine infant baptism, we read the scriptures and the *Paidobaptist* defences of infant baptism. The more we read, the more we examined these records and arguments, the more we were convinced that infant sprinkling was a human tradition. It was not the Baptist, but the Paidobaptist writers who confirmed our reasonings on the scriptures. Since that time we have read a few Baptist works on that question. And since the discovery of immersion for remission, we have read again, with new eyes, sundry ecclesiastical writers. The results of our recent examinations have astonished us as much as they can astonish any of our readers.

Since writing the Extra, we have observed, among others, the following very singular and striking passages:—

George Whitfield, on John iii. and 5. vol. 4. p. 355—says, "Does not this verse urge the *absolute necessity* of water baptism? *Yes:* when it may be had. But how God will deal with persons unbaptized, *we cannot tell.*" This is Mr. Clopton's *charitable* George Whitfield!

John Wesley, in his Preservative, p. 146—150—says, "By baptism we enter into *covenant with God;* an everlasting covenant; are admitted into the church; made members of Christ; made the children of God. By *water*, as the *means*, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again."

Matthew Henry. "In baptism," says he, "our names are engraved upon the heart of this Great High Priest. God doth in this ordinance seal and make over to us *all* the benefits of the death of Christ. Baptism seals the promise of God's being to *me* a God." Treatise on Baptism, p. 12, 40, 42.

Abraham Booth. "If in baptism, then, there be an expressive emblem of *perfect* purification from sin, immersion must be the mode of administration; because nothing short of that represents a *total washing*. I may here venture to appeal to the common sense of mankind, whether pouring or sprinkling a little water on the face, or the *whole body*, be better adapted to excite the idea of an *entire cleansing?*" Paidobaptism Examined, page 63, Newark Ed. 1805.

Vitringa. "The ancient christian church from the highest antiquity after the apostolic times, appears generally to have thought that baptism is absolutely necessary for all that would be saved by the grace of Jesus Christ." Observat Sac. Tom. i. 50. ii. c. 6. §9.

Dr. Owen. "Most of the ancients concluded that baptism was no less necessary unto salvation, than faith or repentance itself." On Justification, c. ii. p. 173.

But what is not a little astonishing, almost all. or, indeed, all, the reformed churches in their confessions and formulas, acknowledge the same to be their views.

*Confession of Bohemia:* "We believe that whatsoever by baptism —is in the outward ceremony signified and witnessed, all that doth the Lord God perform inwardly. That is, he washeth away sin, begetteth a man again, and bestoweth salvation upon him: For the bestowing of these excellent fruits was holy baptism given and granted to the church."

*Confession of Augsburg:* "Concerning baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, as a ceremony ordained of Christ: also, by baptism the grace of God is offered."

*Confession of Saxony:* "I baptize thee; that is, I do witness that by this dipping thy sins be washed away, and that thou art now received of the true God."

*Confession of Whittenburg:* "We believe and confess that baptism is that sea, into the bottom whereof, as the prophet saith, God doth cast all our sins."

*Confession of Helvetia:* "To be baptized in the name of Christ, is to be enrolled, entered and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God; that is to say, to be called the sons of God, to be purged also from the filthiness of sins, and to be endued with the manifold grace of God, for to lead a new and innocent life."

*Confession of Sueveland:* "As touching baptism, we confess, that it is the font of regeneration, washeth away sins and saveth us. But all these things we do understand, as St. Peter doth interpret them. 1. Pet. iii. 21."

*Westminister Assembly:* "Before baptism, the minister is to use some words of instruction—showing, that it is instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ; that it is a seal of the covenant of grace, of our ingrafting into Christ, and of our union with him, of remission of sins, regeneration, adoption, and life eternal."

Thus it appears, that we have all antiquity and nine-tenths of the reformed creeds on our side of this great question. This, with me, weighs nothing, were it not explicitly declared in the "living and effectual word" of the Author of the christian faith. I use it as a mere *argumentum ad hominem*, as an argument to them who cry out innovation, and who superstitiously look up to human authority. Our opponents are the innovators, and they are culpable for holding up the promise of remission to the ear, and for breaking it to the heart of the children of human creeds. They are, however, as consistent in this as preachers generally are. They preach one doctrine in their creeds and practise another in their lives. And how few are the preachers of righteousness of whom it may be said:—

*"And, strange to tell, they practise what they preach!"*

I must thank Mr. Brantly for permitting his readers to read as much of the Extra as he has quoted. Even the *thirty-nine articles*, extracted and modified for me by Silas M. Noel, have been useful. I have learned that some of those who never read, nor could be induced to read any thing I wrote, having read those articles, are now much better disposed to hear us and read our writings than before. Indeed, some have said that these articles, with one or two exceptions, were just what they read and heard from the scriptures.

An honorable and honest opponent, I will, I must, always respect. But when I see a design to suppress, to garble, or to misrepresent, I am assured that all is not sound in Denmark. Why cannot Mr. Brantly or Mr. Clopton take up some proposition we have laid down and disprove it by argument and testimony? There are twelve propositions in the Extra. We stand pledged to sustain them against all assaults. Why not, then, if they think they can disprove them, make a fair effort? Why appeal to the passions and prejudices of their readers? Why impute to us views which we entertain not—sentiments which we avow not—opinions which we never expressed! We are always ready to give scriptural, and, we think, intelligible and fair arguments, for every position we offer

They must see that their present notices and remarks—in short, that their whole course of opposition must beget distrust in their readers, if they think at all, or if they wish them to think upon the subjects, against which they show so much unkind feeling, so much bitterness, and so much cowardice with all. We challenge investigation. To the law and to the testimony we appeal. We feel ourselves secure in the strong holds of scripture and reason. Their feeble and dastardly efforts only increase our confidence, stimulate our energies, and assure us of a final triumph. EDITOR.

## REGENERATION—*No. VI.*

IN examining the manner in which man's original condition and character were changed, we have prepared the way for the consideration of the mode in which his renovation is to be accomplished. God having been forgotten, and self presented to his affections as their supreme object, we have found his noblest powers perverted, and a melancholy train of evil principles introduced. Under some modification, influenced by circumstances or caprice, the desire of self-aggrandizement has reigned in every bosom. The tender infant, just conscious of the presence of surrounding objects, stretches forth his eager hands to seize every thing which meets his eye;—the triumphant victor has wept because he had not more worlds to conquer.

It is evident that the character of man, while he is in this condition, is not susceptible of any elevation. When God had ceased to be the object of his love, his spiritual relations were no longer the subject of his consideration; and the only distinguishing characteristic of his nature, the power of contemplating things spiritual through material objects, now remains dormant, inactive, and concealed. And since the character becomes elevated in proportion to the worthiness of the object of our affections, seeing that material relations now occupy his attention, and that he is, as regards these, a mere animal, and engrossed with the gratification of self-love; it is entirely impossible for him, however he may excel as an *animal*, ever to improve in his character as a *man*. In this situation, to use the language of scripture, "he reviles those things which indeed he does not know; but what things he knows naturally, as an animal void of reason, by these he destroys himself."

Since, then, man is involved in such circumstances, because he loves himself rather than his Creator, it becomes necessary, as the first great step in his restoration, that God should be reinstated in his affections.

Man is the slave of love. Real or imaginary excellence compels his esteem. It exerts an uncontrollable power over his faculties, and the most effectual influence over his conduct. Universal as the law of attraction, there lives not the man who can extricate himself from its dominion. No sooner does he view an object which he conceives worthy of his affections, than he is enlisted in a pursuit which is never given up until something that is in reality, or under existing circumstances, supposed to be more eligible, is discovered.

And it is as impossible for him to love that of which he is ignorant, however deserving it may be, as it is to avoid loving that worthy object with which he is acquainted. He may even be aware of the existence of many things which are in themselves more estimable than those which already engross his attention; but he loves them not, because the examination of their characters and merits being entirely optional with himself, he has never investigated their nature, and remains ignorant of their value.

These things being so, all that was requisite to accomplish the grand design was that God, the most lovely and adorable object in the universe; the author and the source of all that is great and astonishing, beautiful and charming, sublime and glorious; who combines in himself all the excellencies of all things, should exhibit himself to man; and that man should make himself acquainted with the character of God.

In our third essay we considered the circumstances which rendered it necessary that God should reveal himself to man in such a way as to be recognized by his senses, and briefly adverted to some of those manifestations. By these it is, that man, leaving the investigation of the perishing objects of time and sense, gradually ascends to the contemplation of divine beauty and infinite perfection. By these it is that God has presented himself to us in so amiable, so beneficent, so endearing a character, that to behold him is to love him—to love him is to be happy. Do we admire the skilful artist, whose exquisite workmanship has elaborated some ingenious piece of mechanism?—Creation declares the glory of God, the firmament shows his handy work, and even in the vestibule of Nature's temple, man is lost in the contemplation of inimitable charms. Is our attention attracted by some sublime prospect—the yawning gulph, the overhanging precipice—the fierce tornado, or the fearful eruption of volcanic flame? Do we wonder at the strength of the elephant or the lion—the swiftness of the antelope or the eagle—the activity of the monkey or the ape? And do we love the faithfulness of the dog, the gentleness of the lamb, and the innocence of the dove? "Behold," says God, "have not my hand made all these things?" Do our bowels yearn towards our parents, those to whom we are immediately indebted for our existence and our support? God presents himself to us as our Father, the Creator, not only of us ourselves, but of those we love. Are we delighted with magnificence, with majesty, with power? Are we pleased with magnanimity, that greatness of soul which can forgive an injury, and return good for evil—which views the poor with the same complacency as the rich? Seated upon the throne of his glory, our Heavenly Father is represented in the administration of the world, to send his rain upon the just and unjust, and to cause his sun to rise on the evil and on the good. "He bowed the heavens also and came down: and darkness was under his feet. And he rode upon a cherub and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind. He made darkness his secret place: his pavilion round about him were dark waters and thick clouds of the skies." In short, would we dearly

esteem that friend of our bosom, who, seeing the stroke of death about to descend upon us, should interpose himself as a shield, and willingly give in our stead his own life to destruction? Yet God, in the exhibition of his character, has made mean this, even this, the noblest, the most perfect instance of human affection. "Scarcely for a just man will one die, though for a good man one, perhaps, would even dare to die. But his own love towards us God commended, because we being still sinners, Christ died for us." He gave his Son, his own Son, whom he loved. Unable to display his goodness by any description, we must estimate it by what he gave. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes on him may not perish, but obtain eternal life." "In this is love," says an Apostle, "not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent forth his Son to be a propitiation for our sins." This is the talisman which is to change hatred into love, to alter the object of man's affection, and to reform and elevate the human character. In the simple and beautiful language of one of the sacred penmen, "We love him because he first loved us."

He who thus receives into his bosom the love of his Creator, is said to be begotten of God. Having put off the old and put on the new man, who after God is created in righteousness and true holiness, he resembles his Father. The world, it is true, may not know him; but he is not surprized at it, for he remembers that it did not know God manifest in the flesh. Renewed by the Holy Spirit, the image of God is restored to him. Having the same mind he exceedingly stretches himself forward, as an imitator of the Just One, to perform the works which he sees his Father do; whatever is worthy, excellent, or deserving of praise: and reflecting as a mirror, the glory of the Lord is transformed into the same image from glory to glory. As he increases in the knowledge of God, his affections are more and more drawn out after him, his character approaches nearer to perfection; and finally, prepared to enjoy the society and estimate the glories of heaven, he is introduced into that blessed abode where peace, joy, and gladness of heart reign for evermore. "Praise ye the name of the Lord, for his name alone is excellent. Praise God in his sanctuary: praise him in the firmament of his power. Praise him for his mighty acts; praise him according to his excellent greatness. Let every thing that has breath praise the Lord."

DISCIPULUS.

## THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

B. W. STONE, the zealous and intelligent Editor of the Christian Messenger, is directing his readers to the ancient order of things. I am pleased to see him, in the September No. come out decidedly for the ancient practice of the Apostles and Apostolic Church; *viz.* the weekly celebration of the death of Jesus at the Lord's table. I had thought some time ago that he, also, had come out for immersion for the remission of sins; and I am not yet sure that I was mistaken. In the last number, however, there are some sayings that I cannot

fully understand in that light. Many of the Christian preachers have come out for immersion for the remission of sins. I was informed the other day, that in the commonwealth of Ohio, alone, there were 72 of those called Christian preachers who proclaim immersion for remission, and only 11 who opposed it.

In the last Christian Messenger, the editor remarks to a correspondent, that he "will not contend that unbaptized persons are *christians* in the full sense of that term." Unbaptized persons are, at best, then, only *almost*, but not altogether christians. Why, then, teach them that they are safe, because the thief on the cross, and all who were saved before there was any institution for remission, were saved without immersion. Would it not be as good logic to say that men may be saved without faith, because infants are saved without faith, as to say that men may in this world enjoy the salvation of God without immersion, because the thief on the cross enjoyed the future salvation without immersion. To his correspondent he further says, page 236.—"I had remarked that we could pray with unimmersed, holy people, and praise, and perform every act of divine worship with such; and that I found nothing in scripture to forbid me to commune with them at the Lord's table. You condemn this sentiment, and contend that christians should not join with unimmersed persons in any act of worship; for in doing so they would be joining with idolatrous worshippers; as all worship, not instituted by God, is idolatry. To my unknown brother, I refer my former number on this subject; hoping that he may yet see, that the best method of reforming our fellow creatures in error, is to wield the powerful arms of truth, love and forbearance towards them."

If I mistake not, the Apostles were commanded to teach only the immersed to observe and do all things which the Lord commanded. If the Christian Messenger teach the unimmersed to do the things which the Lord commanded, none but the immersed to practise, I should like to have his authority; and, also, to know why he would condemn the Paidobaptist for sprinkling infants.

"I have found nothing in scripture," he replies, "to forbid me to commune with unbaptized persons at the Lord's table." This might be said of a hundred things which the Christian Messenger would tremble to do. But the question is, By what authority, command or precept, does he commune at the Lord's table with unbaptized persons? It is not enough to say there is no command against it. Is there no command for it? If there be not a command or precedent for it, we can easily find one against it. Because whatever is not commanded by the Lord is human, and all human institutions in religion are will-worship, and, as such, obnoxious to the curse. And never yet could I see the consistency in requiring one person to be immersed before admitted into the kingdom, and receiving another without immersion to the blessings of the kingdom. If this be not to build up with one hand and pull down with the other, I have yet to learn how a person can be guilty of such an inconsistency.

I trust, as my friend Stone has long been inquiring for the good

old way, and calling upon his contemporaries to seek the old path, he will not startle at it when it presents itself to his view *so clearly*. I know that he leans very much to what he calls "*charity*," and that he has been long distinguished for charity; but a question may yet arise whether charity, true charity, does not more consist in calling upon men to reform and obey the gospel rather than to flatter them that they may be safe in disobeying God, or in observing and doing such parts of the divine will as they please, or as they please to understand it. If I have at all misapprehended the Christian Messenger, I need not add that it will give me much pleasure, and, no doubt, many others, to perceive that we have misapprehended him.

EDITOR.

## THE BAPTISMAL VOW.

LORD JESUS, that thou art the Messiah, the Messenger of Jehovah, thy words, thy works, and the Holy Spirit, thy Advocate, declare and prove. As the Son, the only begotten of the Father, as coming from his bosom with pledges of love and mercy, I regard thee. As his great Prophet, his consecrated Priest, and anointed King, and as our Mediator in these relations, I acknowledge thee. Thou camest to seek and save the lost, and thou hast invited *sinners* to come to thee. I am a *sinner*, Lord; and as such, I now present myself before thee. Hadst thou not invited and commanded me to come to thee, I dared not to have approached thee, vile and polluted as I am.

The covenant which thou hast stipulated I approve. A God I want whom I can call *my* God. A Saviour I need whom I can call *my* Saviour. A rule of action according to which I can have intercourse with thee engraven on my heart, I desire. A knowledge of thee, which is eternal life, I seek with my whole heart; and, O Lord! remission of my sins, and thy Spirit to comfort me, is what first of all, and most of all, my soul longs for. Into thy family I wish to come, and amongst thy sons and daughters I long to be enrolled. I have heard that thou, the *Faithful and True Witness*, hast commanded immersion into thy death, as a pledge, and as the means of a sinner's forgiveness and adoption into thy family. Therefore, Lord, at thy command I come, relying upon thy word, and am willing to make thee my Prophet, my Priest, and my King, by a covenant never to be forgotten. I do accede to thy own gracious constitution in all its provisions, and do renounce every other prophet, priest, and king, but thee alone. I vow to thee, that whither thou goest, or requirest me to go, I will follow; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God.

In pledge of this I am now willing, and I come, Lord Jesus, to be buried with thee—to put off the body of the sins of my flesh by an immersion into thy death—to bury the old man in this watery grave as thou hast appointed me. I wish to rise with thee, to walk in a new life, and to ascend in my affections to the place where thine honor dwells. And, Lord, as thou, in anticipation of thy burial and resurrection, wast buried in Jordan, and raised out of it; so I wish to see in this my burial and resurrection with thee an assurance that I will be raised from the earthly grave in the morning of the resurrection. Lord Jesus, thou great Shepherd of the sheep, I die to every lord and saviour but to thee—my confidence is in thy blood. I will be buried with thee, and will hope to rise with thee, not only out of this water, but out of my grave at the last day. I take thee, Lord, upon thy own word; receive me now upon this my vow; and as I give myself up to thee in the obedience of faith, so may I live to thee while life endures. "Now may the God of peace, who brought back from the dead my Lord Jesus the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting institution, make me fit for every good work to do his will, producing in me what is acceptable in his sight, through Jesus Christ—to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

The above is *in extenso*, or in detail, what is implied in *putting on Christ* in christian immersion.

EDITOR.

## WESTERN PIONEER.

OUR correspondents frequently inform us how much the opposers of reform profit from those who plead for a restoration of the apostolic institutions. While they appear before the people, declaiming against us, they are teaching, not only in substance, but often in our words and phrases, views and sentiments unequivocally extracted from the speeches and writings of the proclaimers of the ancient gospel. We observe the same in some of our editors. A brother scribe in Illinois, who pretends to be ready to proclaim war against us, is among this class. Take the following specimen from the *Pioneer*, of J. M. Peck, for September last:—

"Another Baptist brother, of respectable standing in both civil and religious society, in one of the upper counties, writes—

"You cannot conceive the great need of a good, intelligent, and faithful preacher of the Baptist order, in this county. Such a one, I hope, you will be able to send us soon. Those we have here make strange havoc of the gospel, by an allegorical, spiritualizing method, of which I will give you the following sample:—The subject was the history of the man going from Jerusalem to Jericho, who fell among thieves. This was his subject. The heads were as follows: The falling among thieves, meant the fall of Adam—they stripped him and left him half dead—stripped him of all power to help himself, as *half* dead means *spiritually* dead, but *naturally* alive. The Levite that passed by, meant the ceremonial law, which could do no good—the priest meant the moral law, and it could not give life. The good Samaritan meant *Christ*, who could relieve. He took the wounded man up and poured in the oil and wine, the grace of God—put him on his own beast, his own gospel platform—took him to an inn, the church—gave the host two pence, the Old and New Testaments—and promised to reward him. This reward was to be in another world, &c."

"Our correspondent adds—

"This kind of preaching is common in this part of the country. The same speaker said that it was one of the strongest evidences of the christian religion for two men from different states to meet and speak the same things."

"*Remarks*—Our worthy brother ought not to express much surprize at so *ingenious* a discourse as he has represented above. No doubt the brother who preached it, really and honestly thought he was preaching the gospel, and probably did throw out many truths; but the *learned* Dr. Gill was ahead of him in the exposition and application of that parable. *He*, and other learned men before him, have gravely written such trifling trash, and preached it too! We presume the brother who preached it, has never read these authors; but he has heard some one preach the same thing before, and he, another, and so on, till it may be traced up to its origin. Now we will seriously and affectionately tell our preaching brethren, that this method of expounding scripture is not preaching the gospel—that God never called them to such solemn trifling—and that were they to receive a letter from a friend and treat it in the same manner some do the lively oracles, they would justly deserve rebuke. This spiritual, figurative, or, more properly, *allegorical* mode of preaching, was invented in the third century, by one *Origen*, a Presbyter of Alexandria, a man of great abilities; but who, by interpreting the Scriptures according to the Platonic philosophy, as it was called, propagated more erroneous opinions than any other man of that period. Preachers should be taught that the Bible is God's revealed word to men—that it is written in human language, and that the very same rules of interpretation should be followed, as would be in interpreting the contents of a letter from a friend, or in understanding any book. A parable should be interpreted as a parable, and in most cases the Saviour himself has left the key to unlock the parables he spoke. When we expound Scripture, it is not enough for us to preach truth and not error. It must be *the truth*, expressed in

the passage. It must be that particular truth which the speaker or writer received and communicated from the Divine Spirit at the time he spoke or wrote. If our Divine Lord, in the parable of the good Samaritan, meant and did teach the whole system of divine truth, in the fall of man—his impotent state, and the gospel method of salvation, in dark and enigmatical language, and if the disciples understood him thus, then the brother who preached, Dr. Gill who wrote, and the whole tribe of allegorizers are right. But if Jesus Christ meant no such thing at the time, and the disciples did not understand him as preaching in this manner, then they are all wrong, and guilty of a most shocking perversion of God's holy word. We have dwelt longer, and expressed ourselves in stronger language on this subject, than our readers, perhaps, deem necessary. But we have the mortifying confession to make, that in our early ministry we were alike guilty of this abuse of Scripture; and then ignorantly supposed that such a method of preaching was not only justifiable, but commendable. We had not then read Gill on the passage; but we had heard an ingenious discourse in the same form; it worked on our mind until finally it was preached. But we really feel thankful that for many years we have been cured of this disease, and have felt that the word of God is too sacred for such trifling.

"We again affectionately urge upon our brethren in the ministry to quit such an unwarrantable use of Scripture; to study for the meaning of any particular passage by its connexion and the general scope of the subject; to learn the proper distinction between parables, figures of speech, and plain sentences; and particularly to become deeply and extensively acquainted with the word of God, or any particular part of it, before they attempt to teach it to others."

*Edit. Pioneer.*

Well said, brother *J. M. Peck!* Why, then, do you choose to appear against us formally and ostensibly? No doubt you have *reasons* for it; but will the Judge of the *secrets* of all hearts *approve your reasons?* A *hint* is all that I intend. You may justify yourself before *men*; but you ought to know that not he who commends himself, but he whom the *Lord* commends, will at last be approved. Dr. Gill, it will be remembered, was a very learned man—very orthodox, an able expositor and critic, and of great authority with Dr. Brantly. But Doctor Peck, a very Regular Baptist, and a warm opposer of the Reformation because, perhaps, he was not the first who thought of it, takes the liberty to dissent from a metropolitan brother, and to place his favorite authority among the mystics and spiritual dreamers!

EDITOR.

## EXTRACTS

### *From the Bracken (Kentucky) Minutes.*

"The church at May's Lick having divided, and each party presented a letter to the Association, claiming to be the original church—

"*Resolved*, That the majority be recognized as such; the minority having embraced a system of things called *Reformation*, thereby departing from the principles of the United Baptists in Kentucky and of the Association.

"Two letters also having been received from the church at Bethel, both claiming to be the original church; and it appearing to the satisfaction of this Association; that the majority of the church have departed from the original principles of the United Baptists—

"*Resolved, therefore*, That the minority be recognized as the church.

"Received two communications from what was formerly called the North District Association, showing that a separation has taken place in that body, produced, as we believe, principally by the common evil that is destroying the Baptist society—

"*Resolved, therefore,* That the ten churches which met at Goshen meeting house, on the 4th Saturday in June, 1830, who manifestly stand opposed to the innovations of Mr. Campbell, and who are disposed to maintain original principles, as believed and practised by our society, be recognized as North District Association, and that our correspondence be continued with them as heretofore."

*Extract from the Circular Letter.*

"*Dear Brethren*—In addressing you at this time, we lament to have to say, that a dark and gloomy cloud overspreads our horizon, unequalled since the establishment of the Baptist society in Kentucky. Associations and churches are dividing, and of course peace and harmony have departed. Our meeting has, in some respects, been unpleasant, several of our churches having separated, and each party presenting their claim to be the original church; also, a separation in the North District Association, both contending to be the Association."——

"The manner in which they speak concerning the divine influence of the Spirit on the human heart; the making baptism the regenerating act, and the actual remission of sins to the believer in baptism; concerning experimental religion; the church being in Babylon, &c. is such that we confess, if it be the gospel of Christ, and the way the Lord brings sinners to the knowledge of the truth, we have it yet to learn. This system being extensively propagated by the Bethany Editor, and by many active and able advocates, tending to produce a revolution in our churches, called forth the efforts that our preachers and brethren have been compelled to use, to maintain, not mere matters of opinion indifferent in themselves, but the grand fundamental truths of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and to resist the inroads making amongst us. And we want it to be distinctly understood, that so far as we know, none of the preachers or churches that are endeavoring to maintain original principles, are contending for any thing but what is common among the Baptists."

The opposers of reform, it seems, simply contend for "what is common among the Baptists." A remark which I made in May last, to the Moderator of the Bracken Association, concerning the liberality of the reforming brethren, and concerning his own ability and that of another member of said Association, to prevent divisions by espousing the cause of reform, which he had long ago acknowledged to be necessary among the Baptists—was converted by him, as I am well informed, into a bribe offered to bring him over! He was wont to complain to me on sundry occasions of the want of liberality in the Baptists to their preachers, and expressed his fears that my remarks in the *Christian Baptist*, on the hireling system, would dry up the last percolations of liberality towards preachers. I assured him, on the occasion alluded to, that these fears were groundless; and as proof, remarked that I was informed that, in proportion as the brethren embraced the principles of reformation, they were distinguished for their acts of liberality.

This conversation has been reported to others as a temptation offered to bring over the Bracken Moderator! And the disinterested preacher proves his devotion to "what is common among the Baptists" by telling how manfully he resisted the temptation. I fear his perseverance to the end, if he manifest no more strength in resisting temptation than he evinced on that occasion. I would be sorry to say that the price offered by me was too low, and that I was outbid by the opponents of reform. But one thing I can say, that I have incompa-

rably more reason to convert his advocating "the things that be" among the Baptists because of the *loaves and fishes*, than he had to convert my remarks into a bribe, and to boast of his strength in resisting temptation. But with all his obliquities and tergiversations, I would be sorry to think, and much more to say, that he regards only the *quid pro quo*, or the emolument which may accrue from his ministrations. I was aware that if William Vaughn and Walter Warder had not opposed reformation, that all the disciples, or nearly all, in the Bracken Association, would have received the apostolic institutions. But to a higher tribunal than the Bracken Association have they and we to give account of our actions.

We have given the above extracts from the Minutes to show with what a high and overbearing hand they managed matters in their late meeting. It is true they have not gone so far as some others; for in one place in Tennessee, two persons were declared *"the church,"* against *one hundred and twenty-eight!!*

We have yet to learn a new lesson if the christians and citizens of Kentucky and the West are held in bondage to human traditions by such men and such measures as are now in repute among the advocates of "what is common among the Baptists." If the advocates of reform go forth in the love of the truth, and avail themselves of the arguments which the Scriptures and these proceedings furnish, their opponents are helping them forward, unintentionally, we presume, more than we ever could have expected. When such men as Walter Warder and William Vaughn can act such a part, what shall we think of the system! How unchristian the scheme which compels its advocates to such measures as inter the gentleman and the christian in the Pope and the Inquisitor. EDITOR.

## EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM OHIO.

"R. B. SEMPLE, in the Millennial Harbinger, No. 8, proposes to you the following inquiry:—'What is your view of the natural state of man? Do you believe him to be, according to your interpretation of the Scriptures, in a state of total depravity?' I have thought the following Scripture throws some light upon that question. Mark x. 14. Christ says, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God.' Does this look like *depravity*, either whole or partial? It appears that Christ was offended at the disciples for their interference, and rebuked them for it. The disciples, no doubt, thought they were not fit subjects, inasmuch as they could not be saved on the gospel plan—by *faith* and *obedience*. But I think Christ clearly conveys the idea that they were already fit subjects of the kingdom without any preparation or change. W. S.

"P. S. Excuse a young disciple for thus writing to you. I have just been changed from a Deist, and may not have taken proper views.

"I acknowledge the testimony brought forward by you (in the debate with Owen) to have been instrumental in my conversion; and I acknowledge the proclamation of the ancient gospel [by brother A. Raines] to have been also instrumental in the glorious change from darkness to light."

[*This young brother in the kingdom will do well to observe that the Saviour does not say the kingdom of God is composed of little children, but of those that are like*

*them. Docility, humility, and harmlessness are the characteristics of little children. It is very obvious from these words, that the Saviour would not have thus expressed himself had he concurred in opinion with those who teach that the infant is as totally depraved as the adult, or as the most flagitious sinner. "Of such" characters, (innocent, docile, and humble,) is the kingdom of Messiah composed. And in the hale and undegenerate days of christianity, as all antiquity avouches, multitudes of little children rejoiced in their adoption into God's family. But that infants, as such, are fit subjects of Messiah's kingdom, neither Jesus nor his Apostles any where teach. For unless born of water and the Spirit into his kingdom they cannot come. With regard to the future and eternal kingdom, as respects infants, the Scriptures teach not that either faith or immersion is necessary. For their salvation the intervention of the second Adam is all-sufficient. For as by the disobedience of one Adam, the many who sinned not as Adam did, by transgressing a positive law, were constituted sinners as respects death; so by the obedience of one Adam, the same many are constituted righteous as respects life. But this only by the way. That the docility and humility of infancy is that alluded to in the passage, is apparent from other passages as well as from the phraseology itself. For "unless you be converted and become (humble) as little children, you cannot enter this kingdom."*]

EDITOR.

## *MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

Thomas Miles. Buckingham Court-House, Va. paid vol. 1 for W Lewis, W C Moseley, G Mosely D Geurrant, Jun. T. Cobbs. J Austin, J Jones, D Geurrant, Sen. F D Wood, G Chambers, T M'Craw, W N Patterson, T W Spurlock, L Davidson, H C Hill, Robert Bolling, J Simmons, R J Gillespie, W Ransom, M W M'Craw, J F Watkins, R S Gray, W H Howard, and himself. J Brewster, Salt Creek, Ohio, paid for vol. 1. P B Pendleton, Stevensville, Va. paid vol 1 for himself, R Bagley, C Hill, C B Fleet, W Campbell, J Duval, and R Lipscomb. T G Blewitt, Chester Court-House, S. C. paid for vol. 1. W Churchill, Deerfield, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for H Rogers, J Hartzell, and P Hartzell; also, for W Richardson and J Miller of Springfield, and B Austin, Warren, 1 dollar; also, for E Ward, Randolf. Elder J Favor, jun. Athens, Ala. paid vol. 1 for himself, and J Favor, Sen. J Pool, Minerva, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for C Welty, J Shriver, A Taber, F Unkefer, and J Haines. J Prewitt, Fayette, Mo. paid vol. 1 for T A Smith, H L Boon, W Hughes, J Tassey, and W J Wilson. J. Cahoon, Dover. O. paid vol. 1 for D Hamblin. J Dougherty, Steubenville, paid for vol. 1. A E Baker, Mansfield, New York, paid for vol. 1. P. Noland, Rodney, Mi. paid vol. 1 for himself and B P Sanders. J Bryan, Hopkinsville, Ky. paid vol. 1 for S Wilkinson, R Rowland, Cammack & Williams, M Wilson, and M Gray. O Clapp, Esq. Mentor, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for S Parmley, E Champney, and L Forbes. W Hayden, Austintown, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for D Loveland. Nath. Burrus, Elkton, Ky. paid vol, 1 for R B Knight, J S Anderson, W Greenfield, R Hatcher, and J W Lumsden. B Hicks, Lexington, Ky. paid vol. 1 for B Scott and A Smith. B Worthen, Cynthiana, Ky. paid vol 1 for P Wherrit, D Humphrey, N White, E Mason, and N M'Farland. J W Bastin, Lancaster, Ky. paid vol. 1 for himself. W Dupree, Hazle Green, Ala. paid vol. 1 for himself and A Root. D Hughes, Old Court-House Miss. paid vol. 1 for W Bradshaw of New Orleans, A Brown and J Speed of Old Court House. J D Barker, Maysville, Ky. paid vol. 1 for J G Bacon. J B Yarnall, Miesburg, Pa. paid vols. 1 and 2 for himself. Dr. Affleck, Barnesville, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for himself. C. Sawyer, Reesville, New York, paid vol. 1 for himself. T Bullock, Versailles, Kentucky, paid volume 1 for James Sullivan, J B Jessee, W Peters, S Ware, and C Bacon. W Z Thompson, Doneraile, Ky. paid vol 1 for James Wood, John Runyan, M. Stone, and James Henderson. W Bruce, Bruceville, Ind. paid vol. 1 for J P Cox.]

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 11. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1830. Vol. 1.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## METAPHYSICAL REGENERATION—*No. II.*

## *FULLERISM AND SANDEMANIANISM EXPOSED.*

MR. FULLER, in his Strictures on Sandemanianism, New York edition, page 7, makes the following remarks:—

"It is not my design to censure Sandemanianism in the gross. There are many things in the system which, in my judgment, are worthy of serious attention. If Mr. Sandeman, and his followers, had only taught that faith has revealed truth for its object, or that which is true antecedent to its being believed, and whether it be believed or not—that the finished work of Christ, exclusive of every act, exercise, or thought of the human mind, is that for the sake of which a sinner is justified before God—that no qualifications of any kind are necessary to warrant our believing in him—and that the first scriptural consolation received by the believer arises from the gospel and not from reflecting on the feelings of his own mind towards it, they would have deserved well of the church of Christ."

In these *four* great principles, Messrs. Sandeman and Fuller agree. In the second, I dissent from them both; viz. "That the finished work of Christ, exclusive of every act, exercise, or thought of the human mind, is that for the sake of which a sinner is justified before God." This Fullerism and Sandemanianism, I hold to be flatly contradictory to the most express testimonies of the sacred writings. The "*finished work of Christ*" is here exhibited as that alone, exclusive of any thought, volition, or exercise of mind, or body, on account of which a man is justified or pardoned. I ask, then, Why are not all men pardoned or justified by his finished work? We must answer For the want of some thought, volition, or act of the mind or body to connect them with, or, if any one pleases, to interest them in, this finished work.

Fuller and Sandeman agree too well in metaphysical regeneration, or a regeneration without any thought, volition, or act of mind or body, to understand why faith, reformation, and immersion were so much insisted upon by the inspired teachers. If faith, reformation, and immersion be not a thought, volition, exercise, or act of mind or body, then these metaphysicians are right, and we are metaphysically wrong; but if faith, reformation, and immersion be a thought, volition, exercise, or act of mind or body, then are they in error. Let the Fullerites be cautious in examining this! Fullerism and

Sandemanianism are one and the same in the grand essentials, although the two gentlemen quarrel about their "*non*-essentials" in doctrine.

Both these writers concur, and I am happy in agreeing with them, in denouncing that which some of the Fullerites in this country and the Gillites unscripturally call *christian experience*. Mr. Fuller goes as far in this as I have ever gone. He says, page 13:—

"If the attention of the awakened sinner, instead of being directed to Christ, be turned inward, and his mind be employed in searching for evidences of his conversion, the effect must, to say the least, be uncomfortable, and may be fatal, as it may lead him to make a righteousness of his religious feelings, instead of looking out of himself to the Saviour.

"Nor is this all:—If the attention of christians be turned to their own feeling instead of the things which should make them feel, it will reduce their religion to something vastly different from that of the primitive christians. Such truths as the following were the life of their spirits. "Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners—Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and was buried and rose again the third day according to the scriptures.—Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead according to my gospel—we have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God," &c. But by the turn of thought, and strain of conversation in many religious connexions of the present day, it would seem as if these things had lost their influence. They are become "dry doctrines," and the parties must have something else. The elevation and depression of their hopes and fears, joys and sorrows, is with them the favorite theme. The consequence is, as might be expected, a living to themselves rather than to him that died and rose again; and a mind either elated by unscriptural enjoyment, or depressed by miserable despondency. It is not by thinking and talking of the sensations of hunger, but by feeding on the living aliment, that we are filled and strengthened."

In these sentiments, I am happy to accord fully with Mr. Fuller. I might quote many passages from this work in which Mr. Fuller speaks like a christian, and in which he reprobates the Regular Baptists as much as the Sandemanians. Page 15, he says:—

"Past experiences can no otherwise be an evidence of grace to us, than as the remembrance of them rekindles the same sentiments and feelings anew. But to object to all peace of mind arising from a consciousness of having done the will of God, and to denominate it "confidence in the flesh," is repugnant to the whole tenor of scripture.

"A system may contain much important truth, and yet be blended with so much error, as to destroy its salutary efficacy. Mr. Sandeman has expunged from christianity a great deal of false religion; but whether he has exhibited that of Christ and his Apostles, is another question."

But the misfortune is, that Mr. Fuller sometimes contradicts himself. After, in page 7, agreeing with Mr. Sandeman in those positions which I have quoted from him, in page 28, he contradicts himself—

"If," says he, "it be meant to deny that any deed or thought on the part of man is necessary *in the established order of things*, or that sinners *are* presented spotless before God without a deed or a thought on the subject, it is very false, and goes to deny the necessity of faith to salvation; for surely no man can be said to believe in Christ without thinking of him."

But to return to metaphysical regeneration. With Mr. Fuller there is a twofold regeneration—a "strict" and a "general". "Like every other term," says he, in the appendix, page 210, "it (regen-

eration) is sometimes used in a more strict and sometimes in a more general sense." We have before shown the term is used but *twice* in all the Jewish and Christian scriptures.

In his Strictures on Sandemanianism, written some years afterwards, he says, page 135:—"Though in a *general* sense it be true that we are regenerated *by* believing the gospel, yet in a more *particular* sense it is equally true that we are regenerated *in order to it*." Mr. Fuller has a *general* regeneration to offer to his opponents when he is pressed by their arguments, and a *particular* regeneration for himself.

This *particular* or *strict* regeneration, he defines to be "a real physical work, whereby the Holy Spirit imparts spiritual life to the souls of all who are truly regenerated," p. 132. He adds, "When God created the soul of man originally in righteousness and true holiness, I suppose it must be allowed to have been a physical work. Man certainly was not induced by motives to be righteous any more than to be rational." The doctrine, then, is, God made man righteous as he made him rational without any moral means, and now he makes, or creates, him anew, or regenerates him without any means, other than he employed in making man rational, or in creating man at first. This philosophy is most unphilosophic, and what is incomparably worse, it makes the Word of God of non-effect. Mechanical power is employed upon what already exists; but physical power, when referred to God, denotes such energy as was displayed in originating the heavens and the earth, or such power as was displayed in causing an ear to grow on Malchus, an arm or limb upon a maimed person, or the infusion of life into Lazarus, Dorcas, and the son of the widow of Nain.

To talk of a *physical* work upon the soul is, in my humble opinion, preposterous in the extreme. Not a Doctor in christendom can define it: no, not one. To argue about an indefinable nonentity is not more ridiculous than to hear scribes and elders talk about a physical operation upon a spirit, or upon the soul of man. Such a thing is inconceivable to any mind unsophisticated by mysticism. The spirit of man ought to have been shown to be susceptible of such a power. Why did all the doctors of physical regeneration of spirits, all the living and all the dead, take for granted, that the spirit, or soul of man, is, or can be, a subject of physical influence or power? They seem, one and all, to have taken this for granted; and so all their reasonings are based upon a mere assumption. We may be the first who have called this assumption in question; but whether or not, we affirm it to be an untenable, because an irrational and unscriptural assumption. No man can demonstrate from any principle, natural or moral, that the soul of man can be the subject of any operation, or power, that is either physical or mechanical. Let some of the Fullerites attempt this; for if this cannot be sustained, their system vanishes into smoke. Whenever they prove that any power other than *moral*, or any power purely physical, can operate upon

the soul of man; in one word, that it can be the subject of physical operations, then I will prove that spirits may be pierced with a dagger, or beheaded with a sword.

But the assumption is absurd on other grounds. Physical power could not renew, or regenerate, man, because his fall was not effected by physical power. If the soul of man had been physically destroyed, it might be more plausible (but even then only plausible) to talk of its being physically restored. If the Devil had overcome and ruined Eve and Adam by physical power, then it would have been necessary for man to be physically cured, or restored by physical power. But Satan did not operate physically upon the soul or body of Eve, and consequently physical power is not now called for. He operated by motives, arguments, or what is called moral means. By these means the happy pair were dethroned.

We shall suppose a case and submit it to the Fullerites. Suppose, then, Satan, who was stronger than Eve, had physically, or by power, taken hold of her arm, opened her fingers, and made them close on the fruit of the forbidden tree, and then, by his strength, made her hand pull it off, and put it into her mouth, would she have fallen by such an act? They answer, No. I am bold to affirm that they will say, that man could not have fallen by any physical operation. If, then, man could not fall by physical operations, how can he be restored by them? It is, in my judgment, as impossible to restore, or renew, man by physical operations, as it was for him to fall by such means. As he could not fall by physical operations, it is absurd, then, to argue that he can be renewed by them. Wise, and learned, and good as Andrew Fuller may have been, and as his American and English disciples now are, we cannot refrain from affirming that, to our apprehension, they appear to assume, as a fundamental principle, a position at war with reason, experience, and revelation. I trust that if any of his disciples in this country think the system defensible, they will attend to, and attempt to solve on some principle, the case which we have here submitted.

The power which Satan employed was his *word*. All his energy was put forth in his word. He was a better philosopher than any of our opponents; for he knew too well that a spirit could not be operated upon physically, and, therefore, he could not even imagine such a thing as the fall of man by physical operations.

Satan has an honor bestowed upon him by the mystic spiritualizers to which he is not entitled. They represent him as wiser and more puissant than the Almighty. They say he could subvert and ruin the race of men by *his word* without any physical operation on the body or soul of man; but God cannot restore, or save man by *his word* without the use of other weapons than Satan employed against him. Satan's bow and arrow, his sling and stone, say they, call for the artillery, all the munitions of Heaven, physical and moral.

Prove, then, Fullerites, that Satan used other means than his word to ruin man, before you say and teach that God's word is not able to restore him!! Prove that the soul of man is, or can be, the subject

of physical operation before you preach physical regeneration. Prove that physical power can restore one morally depraved, or that sin can be cured by strength, or the conscience by force before you proclaim the impotency of God's word, or the necessity of almighty strength to new-create, or repair, the soul of man.

Until these remains of the dark and barbarous night of Mystery Babylon, are scattered to the four winds of heaven, until these fragments of the Platonic science, falsely so called, and the Aristotelean categories are banished from christian assemblies, the oracles of the living God will be despised, and men will grope in darkness, live and die in doubt, and in despair, as they have so often and so long done under the doctrine of physical and metaphysical regeneration.

Incur what censure we may, our veneration for the great Teacher sent from God, and our benevolence for our deluded contemporaries, command us to expose the sophisms of the schools, and to proclaim an interminable war against mystic doctors, mystic systems, and mystic religionists, however consecrated in the affections of a population whose reason has been perverted, whose minds have been confused, and whose consciences have been polluted with the mysteries and idolatries of an apostate church.

We have traced these errors to their sources. And, if the Lord permit, we will assist others in tracing them through all their meanderings up to the fountain. We have now glanced at only one of the assumptions in the propositions in which it was found. Concerning the implantation of "*spiritual life*," we shall offer some remarks in our next. EDITOR.

## SPIRITUAL BODY.

THIS term is used by the apostle Paul when discussing the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead, 1 Cor. ch. xv. and in reply to the question, "With what body do they come?" ver. 35. In answer to this inquiry, as it respects the saints who have died in the faith of Christ, he proceeds to show the difference between the body which falls into the grave and that with which they shall be raised. In allusion to a grain of wheat falling into the ground, he says, It is sown in corruption, that is, in a state of mortality, subject to death according to the original sentence, and having in its constitution the principles of dissolution and putrefaction—it is raised in incorruption, without any tendency to decay or dissolve; of a pure unfading and immortal nature. Thus our Lord says of those who are raised, "Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels." Luke x. 36. It is sown in dishonor, a mean and contemptible thing, liable to degradation, deformity, and defilement; a vile body or the body of our humiliation, Phil. iii. 21. But behold the change! it is raised in glory, not merely in a state of honor and immortality, but in a beautiful, majestic, and resplendent appearance, fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body; for the glorified body of the Saviour is the exemplar, or pattern, of the body of the saints in their resur-

rection state. It is sown in weakness; it subsists in this world in a state of weakness and dependence, frail in its constitution, feeble in its exertions and operations; liable to weariness, faintings, pain and sickness; incident to all kinds of infirmities and diseases; and subject to innumerable injuries, Job iv. 19. and when laid in the dust it is weaker still, utterly inactive and defenceless, an easy prey even to worms, Job xix. 26. But it is raised in power, that is, in a strong, vigorous, and healthy state, exempt from all constitutional infirmities, and insusceptible of all external injuries: it will be active and unwearied in its operations, so as to keep pace with the soul in all its exalted exercises and employments without weariness or fainting. It is sown a natural body—it is an earthy tabernacle, suited to the purposes and functions of the animal life, which are common to us with the brute creation, such as feeding upon the fruits of the earth, vegetating, and producing its kind; endued with various appetites and desires after earthy objects; and sustained, recruited and gratified by means of food, of sleep and of air, so that were the body deprived of any of these it would soon become a lifeless corpse. But it is raised a spiritual body; for "there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." By a spiritual body, we are not to understand a pure spirit; for that would not be a body at all, nor would it be a resurrection. But the body will be spiritual in regard to its substance; it will be of a rarified and refined contexture, purged of all its present earthy grossness, and of a nature so alert and active as to resemble that of spirits. But it will also be spiritual in respect of its desires and manner of subsistence: it will be divested of all its sensual and animal appetites, by means of which it was attached to the things of earth and made dependent upon them for its subsistence. In short, it will be a spiritual body as being quickened by the Holy Spirit, Rom. viii. 11. and entirely fitted for spiritual and heavenly exercises and employments in perfect unison with the soul, and not as now clogging its operations, and warring against it by the law in its members. The apostle proceeds to illustrate his subject by considering Adam and Christ as the two public heads or representatives of their respective seeds: "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul"—his body, formed of the dust, was quickened by the breath of God into an animal sensitive frame, fitted for the functions and enjoyments of this earthy life: the last Adam was made a quickening spirit, having life in himself to quicken whom he will, John v. 21, 26. and so he conveys a spiritual and immortal life to the bodies of his saints, at the resurrection, Rom. viii. 11. This is the apostle's proof for the spiritual body and the original of it. So that, as Adam, by the breath of life breathed into him, became a living soul, and the source of the animal body and natural life to his posterity; even so Christ, being quickened from the dead, became the source of the spiritual body, and the everlasting heavenly life to all who stand connected with him. John xiv. 19; ch. xvii. 2. And the apostle concludes this most interesting discourse by affirming that as we have borne the image of the earthy, that is of the first man Adam,

in our mortal dying animal bodies, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly, or the Lord Jesus Christ in his glorified state, in our spiritual, immortal, and glorifiied bodies. The following remarks, on the manner of Christ's appearance to his disciples, after his resurrection, seem to have an intimate connexion with the nature and properties of the spiritual body, and, as such, merit the reader's attentive consideration. If we consider the manner of our Lord's appearance to his disciples after his resurrection, we shall find even in his interviews with them, no trace of that easy familiarity of intercourse which obtained between them before his death, when he condescended to lead his whole life in their society, as a man living with his equals. Had the history of his previous life been as mysteriously obscure, as that of the forty days between the resurrection and ascension is in many circumstances; had his previous habits been as studiously reserved, proof would indeed have been wanting that he had ever sustained the condition of a mortal man, and the error of the Docetæ, who taught that he was a man in appearance only, might have been universal. But the truth is, that the scheme of redemption required, that before the passion the form of the servant should be predominant in the Redeemer's appearance; that after his resurrectton, the form of God should be conspicuous. Accordingly, thoughout his previous life his manners were grave, but unreserved, serious rather than severe; his deportment highly dignified, but unassuming; and the whole course and method of his life was unconcealed, and it appears to have been the life of a man in every circumstance. He had a home at Capernaum, where he lived with his mother and her family, except when the stated festivals called him to Jerusalem, or the business of his ministry induced him to visit other towns. When he travelled about the country to propagate his doctrine and to heal those that were vexed of the devil, the evangelical history, for the most part, informs us whence he set out and whither he went; and with as much accuracy as can be expected in such compendious commentaries as the gospels are, we are informed of the time of his departure from one place, and of his arrival at another. We can, for the most part, trace the road by which he passed; we can mark the towns and villages which he touched in his way; and in many instances we are told, that in such a place he was entertained at the house of such a person. Upon these journies he was attended by the twelve and other disciples, and except upon one or two very extraordinary occasions, he travelled along with them, and just as they did. Upon some occasions his own body was the subject of his miraculous power. In its natural constitution, however, it was plainly the mortal body of a man. It suffered from inanition, from fatigue and external violence, and needed the refection of food, of rest, and sleep: it was confined by its gravity to the earth's surface: it was translated from one place to another by a successive motion through the intermediate space: and if in a few instances, and upon some very extraordinary occasions, it was exempted from the action of mechanical powers, and divested of its

physical qualities and relations,—as when, to escape from the malice of a rabble, he made himself invisible, and when he walked upon a stormy sea. These were the only instances of our Lord's miraculous powers in his own person, which no more indicate a preternatural constitution of his body, than his other miracles indicate a preternatural constitution of the bodies on which they were performed. That he walked upon the sea is no more a sign of an uncommon constitution of his own body, which sunk not, than of the water which sustained it. In every circumstance therefore of his life, before his passion, the blessed Jesus appears a mortal man. An example of virtue he indeed exhibited, which never other man attained. But the example was of human virtues; of piety, of temperance, of benevolence, and of whatever in the life of man is laudable. Before his resurrection, it was in power only, and in knowledge, that he shewed himself Divine. After his resurrection the change is wonderful. Insomuch that, except in certain actions which were done to give his disciples proof that they saw in him their crucified Lord arisen from the grave, he seems to have done nothing like a common man. Whatever was natural to him before, seems now miraculous; what was before miraculous, is now natural. The change first appears in the manner of his resurrection. It is evident that he had left the sepulchre before it was opened. And an angel, indeed, was sent to roll away the stone, but this was not to let the Lord out, but to let the women in. For no sooner was the thing done than the angel said to the women, "He is not here, he is risen; come and see the place where the Lord lay." Matthew's women saw the whole process of the opening of the sepulchre, for they were there before it was opened. They felt the earthquake; they saw the angel of the Lord descend from heaven; they saw him roll away the vast stone which stopped the mouth of the sepulchre, and, with a threatening aspect, seat himself upon it; they saw the sentinels fall down petrified with fear. Had the Lord been waiting within the tomb for the removal of the stone, whence was it that they saw him not walk out? If he had a body to be confined, he had a body to be actually visible; and it is not to be supposed that with or without the heavenly guard which now attended him, he was in fear of being taken by the sentinels and put a second time to death, that for his security he should render himself invisible. But he was already gone. The huge stone, which would have barred their entrance, had been no bar to escape. With the manner of leaving the sepulchre, his appearances, first to the women, afterwards to the apostles, correspond. They were, for the most part, unforseen and sudden; nor less suddenly he disappeared. He was found in company without coming in; he was missing again without going away. He joined, indeed, the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, like a traveller passing the same way; and he walked along with them, in order to prepare them by his conversation for the evidence which they were to receive of his resurrection. But no sooner was the discovery made, by a peculiar attitude which he assumed in the breaking of bread, than he disap-

peared instantaneously. The same evening he presented himself to the apostles, at a late hour, assembled in a room with the doors shut; that is, fast made up with bolts and bars, for fear of a visit from the unbelieving Jews, their persecutors. To him who had departed from the unopened sepulchre, it was no difficulty to enter the barricadoed chamber. From all these circumstances it is evident that his body had undergone its change. The corruptible had put on incorruption. It was no longer the body of a man in its mortal state; it was the body of a man raised to life and immortality, which was now mysteriously united to divinity. And as it was by miracle that, before his death he walked upon the sea, it was now by miracle that, for the conviction of the apostles he shewed in his person the marks of his sufferings. Consonant with this exaltation of his human nature was the change in the manner of his life. He was repeatedly seen by the disciples after his resurrection; and so seen as to give them many infallible proofs that he was the very Jesus who had suffered on the cross. But he lived not with them in familiar habits. His time, for the forty days preceding his ascension was not spent in their society. They knew not his goings out and comings in. Where he lodged on the evening of his resurrection, after his visit to the apostles, we read not; nor were the apostles themselves better informed than we. To Thomas, who was absent when our Lord appeared, the report of the rest was in these words, "We have seen the Lord." That was all they had to say: they had seen him, and he was gone. They pretend not to direct Thomas to any place where he might find him and enjoy the same sight. None of them could now say to Thomas as Nathaniel once said to Philip, "Come and see." On the journey from Jerusalem to Galilee, he was not their companion—he went before them. How he went we are not informed. The way is not described; the places are not mentioned through which he passed; their names are not recorded who accompanied him on the road, or who entertained him. The disciples were commanded to repair to Galilee. They were not told to seek him at Capernaum, his former residence, or to inquire for him at his mother's house. They were to assemble at a certain hill. Thither they repaired; they met him there; and there they worshipped him. The place of his abode for any single night of all the forty days, is no where mentioned; nor, from the most diligent examination of the story, is any place of his abode on earth to be assigned. The conclusion seems to be, that on earth he had no longer any local residence, his body requiring neither food for its subsistence nor a lodging for its shelter and repose: he was become the inhabitant of another region, from which he came occasionally to converse with his disciples: his visible ascension, at the expiration of the forty days, being not the necessary means of his removal, but a token to the disciples that this was his last visit; an evidence to them that the heavens had now received him, and that he was to be seen no more on earth with the corporeal eye till the restitution of all things. I might have been less particular in the detail of circumstances which lead to this con-

clusion, had it appeared in our English Bible, as it does in the original, that Porter roundly asserts the very same thing in the words of my text, "Him God raised up the third day," says Peter, "and shewed him openly," as our English Bibles have it, "not to all the people." But here is a manifest contradiction. Not to be shown to all the people is not to be shewn openly. To be shewn openly therefore not to all the people, is to be shewn and not to be shewn at the same time. The literal meaning of the Greek words is this, "Him God raised up the third day, and gave him to be visible." Not openly visible; no such thing is said; it is the very thing denied; but "he gave him to be visible." Jesus was no longer in a state to be naturally visible to any man. His body was indeed risen, but it was become that body which Paul describes in the 15th chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, which having no sympathy with the gross bodies of this earthly sphere, nor any place among them, must be indiscernible to the human organs, till they shall have undergone a similar refinement. The divinity united to the blessed Jesus produced in a short space that change in him, which in other men, according to the mysterious physics of Paul, must be the effect of a slower process. The divinity united to him having raised him on the third day from the grave, in a body incorruptible and invisible, gave him to become visible occasionally, not to all the people, but to his chosen witnesses; to those who were chosen to the privilege of beholding God face to face in the person of his Son, of attesting the fact of Christ's resurrection, and of publishing through the world the glad tidings of the general redemption. Thus, you see, every appearance of our Lord to the apostles after his resurrection, was, in truth, an appearance of the great God, the Maker of heaven and earth, to mortal man. The conferences, though frequent, seem to have been short, and upon each occasion mixed with that condescension which was necessary to give the disciples sensible evidence of the reality of the resurrection. We discover much of a reserved dignity in his deportment; a tone of high authority prevails in his language, and something profoundly mysterious in his actions. His familiar conversation with the world before his passion, was a principle branch of his humiliation; and his humiliation was an essential part of those sufferings by which the guilt of a man was expiated. But the atonement being once made, the form of a servant was to be removed; Christ was to re-assume his glory, and to be seen no more but as the only begotten of the Father. See Bishop Horseley's Nine Sermons on the Nature of the Evidence of Christ's Resurrection, Sermon iv. p. 197, &c.—*Biblical Cyclopædia, or Dictionary of the Holy Scriptures by William Jones, Author of the History of the Christian Church, vol. 2d. London Ed.* 1824. [Communicated by W. C. Baltimore.]

## To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.

*Dear Brother,*

THE dominant priesthood are using all their ingenuity and craft to prejudice the minds of your readers and the community against you. I have looked on and listened with astonishment at their conduct, and asked myself, Can this

be the fruits of the christian religion, or is it not some other spirit that the present order of things has produced?

The Apostle John exhorts us to "try the spirits whether they are of God, because *many* false prophets are gone out into the world. *Hereby know we the Spirit of God;* every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is in the world" I understand this Apostle that there would be, and were teachers gone out, that refused to own Jesus Christ as Lord of All. They preferred their own views or plans to the writings of his Apostles. They are of the world, therefore the world heareth them; that is, they are uninspired men, that have assumed to themselves to decide upon what is essential to salvation and what is not. "He that knows God, hears us," [that is, the Apostles of Jesus Christ, and not uninspired men."] "Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." Those who take the writings of the Apostles as their guide to the christian church, and own Jesus in word and deed, are of God. Those who have *ladders* or *scaffolds* to climb up to the christian church, or build up a sect called the church of Jesus Christ, are not of God.

If any man renounce the dogmas of these uninspired men, and take the writings of the Apostles as a rule of faith and practice, however orderly, pious, and useful he may be, all this goes for nothing—he is treated as a publican and a heathen man. Ask them why they act thus—they reply, You have changed your sentiments, and how can two walk together except they be agreed? These men preach reformation; and so soon as one is disposed to reform, they gather the pack (bigots) and raise the hue and cry. If he be a teacher the doors of the meeting houses are shut against him, and all fellowship is disclaimed with him, for no other reason than that of his being honest enough to forsake his errors, and teach men to conform, or reform their views and practices to the standard of the inspired Apostles.

I have known churches living in peace and love where the ancient gospel was proclaimed. No sooner did some heresiarch hear of it, than he, under pretence of *great love for the brethren,* visited them, and pitched upon some of the intolerant spirits he knew would subserve his views. The war-whoop was soon heard—schisms were soon made among brethren that were living in peace, by those that love to be busy bodies in other men's matters. Then, of course, all the blame was thrown upon those who were willing to live in fellowship with their brethren, though they differed in opinion.

I have so often heard from the priesthood that you are a Haldanian, (for the members do not know what are the sentiments of Haldane, nor do I,) and having never read one page of Haldane's writing, except where it has been quoted by other authors, I felt anxious to find out what part of Haldane's writings was so heretical or impure as to become a term of reproach I therefore searched the Christian Baptist, in order to discover, if possible, what part of Haldane's conduct and sentiments produced so unchristian a course as has been pursued towards the friends of the ancient order of things. In vol. 3, page 197, I found a letter which you say was written by "one of the most intelligent, pious, and worthy Bishops in Virginia." This Bishop admits that the Haldanians "*have many excellent things among them—things he would gladly see more prevalent among us;* but in *some* respects they are far from pure christianity."

"Forbearance is certainly a christian grace, strongly recommended by precept and example in the word of God. It is an important branch of charity, without which knowledge is nothing, and the eloquence of angels nothing more than a tinkling cymbal. WITHOUT CHRISTIAN FORBEARANCE NO CHURCH FELLOWSHIP CAN BE MAINTAINED, AT LEAST SO I THINK. The Haldanians, I am persuaded, *are greatly deficient on this head.* I do not say they are wholly without *forbearance;* but they limit its exercise to too *narrow bounds.* In all *church decisions, say they, there must be a unanimity—all must think alike.*

However desirable this may be, *it is impossible. Men will differ in opinion honestly.* Hence, unless allowance be made for ignorance, for humor, and even for obstinacy, there will be but little peace; or, however, peace cannot subsist long."

"The essence of the gospel must be maintained at the expense of even life itself; and to do this more effectually, *we must use forbearance* in minor things. Gentleness of spirit becomes a servant of the Lord, and especially *towards those who oppose truth,* as being the most likely to bring them to repentance. Hence the persecutions of every age have been on the side of error."

So writes this excellent Bishop from King and Queen county. If I understand him, he is opposed to christians making their opinions a bond of union. This is, as he says, "far from pure christianity." Such conduct is sure to produce persecutions; and he says, "Persecutions in every age have been on the side of error." These are important truths, and I am of this Bishop's opinion. But, alas! how fearful some men are of changing their opinions; and yet how changeable they are!

I find in the 5th volume of the Christian Baptist, page 198, this same Bishop writes from *Washington* to Silas M. Noel, D. D. and tells him, "The Baptists have been a divided people, owing (I think) to the want of a proper respect for established opinions, customs, whether written or otherwise." "In my address to him a year or two ago, I said, if his principles prevailed, a new sect started up. Such are my views, and my deliberate judgment tells me that there is much less ground for fellowship with such a sect, than with Presbyterians, or even evangelical Episcopalians."

I ask, Can this Bishop review these two letters, and then inquire into the state of the churches in Kentucky and other places, and say that he and your opponents have not manifested what he calls the "Haldanian spirit." and have been the *occasion* of all the turmoil and schism among the brethren in the churches? Where is this *forbearance,* which he says "is certainly a christian grace, strongly recommended both by precept and example in the word of God, and is an important branch of charity; without which, knowledge is nothing, and the eloquence of angels is nothing more than a tinkling cymbal, and without which no church fellowship can be manifested;" and that "it is impossible for men to think alike—men will differ in opinion honestly."

I am fully persuaded that your opponents are according to this Bishop's views of Haldane, more in the spirit of Haldane than you are, or any of the friends of the ancient order of things. No man of truth can say that you or they make your opinions, "whether written or otherwise," a bond of union, or test of fellowship. No, sir, this is the antichristian spirit. Look at the conduct of the Jews, the Roman Catholics, and all the sects in christendom, and we see this spirit of intolerance manifested against all those that differ in opinion with them. They will not suffer any man to reform and remain among them. *They make "sects,"* and then condemn them for discharging their duty to God. The conduct of Abner W. Clopton with his Association demonstrates my assertion. It is slander to call the friends of the ancient order of things, a sect, different from that sect, in their views and practices, raised up by the inspired Apostles of Jesus Christ, without pointing out their departure from the writings of the Apostles—as much so, as if I were to charge them with being thieves and robbers without producing the evidence of their guilt.

SCRUTATOR.

---

*For the Millennial Harbinger.*

## TO R. T. BROWN.

*Dear Brother,*

YOUR candid letter demands and receives my serious attention. The temper it exhibits must be cherished by all who would come to the stature of men in Christ Jesus. I desire, with you, to

avoid that dogmatical spirit which savors of assumed infallibility, and I rejoice that we have one periodical unshackled by human systems and party views, presenting a medium for free discussion to all who are meekly and earnestly searching after the infinite treasure of divine truth.

Most cordially do I adopt the principle, that "*in matters of religion nothing is good authority which does not bear as old a date as the days of the Apostles.*" Far be it, that the disciples of the Lord Jesus should continue to impeach his wisdom and goodness by reverencing any thing as such authority except that Word which abideth forever. So prone, however, are we to be insensibly biassed by various causes, that we have continual need to pray, "Make me to understand the way of thy precepts."

You remark, "The general prevalence of the idea that unbelievers believe, is to me the greatest miracle of this age." Again, "Strange to say, I know of a number of persons who seriously contend that believing what the Scriptures say of Jesus Christ, is not faith in Jesus Christ." I am not one of this number. I admit that if a man believes *truth*, whether it respects Jesus Christ or any other subject, so far he has true faith. But I ask, Is it any "miracle" that a man should believe some truths respecting Jesus Christ, and at the same time not believe other truths which must be believed if he would be saved? Is it "strange," or is it more "strange" than true, that men believe that Jesus Christ was born in Judea, died on the cross, rose from the dead, and ascended to heaven, while they do not believe "the truth" which he came down from heaven to declare? You, indeed, misapprehend me, if you suppose I contend for the belief of any truth "*unconnected* with this glorious truth that Jesus the Messiah has come in the flesh, died, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures." It is, however, my firm belief, that men are convinced of the truth of these facts, and at the same time, in the pride of their hearts will not believe other truths which must be believed if they would be saved. You ask, most reasonably, "What position faith in Jesus Christ is a conviction of the truth of?" I reply, (not in the words of some "human system of divinity," under the influence of which you fear I labor, but in the words which the Holy Spirit teacheth,) "The message which we have heard of him—that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all"—"all have sinned and come short of the glory of God"—and "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." These truths must be believed in connexion with the recorded facts of the death, resurrection, and ascension of the Messiah, for these truths impart to those facts their chief importance and glory. Our blessed Master, praying for his disciples, said, "I have declared unto them THY NAME, and will declare it, that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them and I in them." Again—"He that heareth *my word*, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." By the Father's *name*, I understand his perfections. By the word of Christ, his testimony in general concerning the holy character of God, the consequent evil of sin, and justice of our con-

demnation—his testimony respecting himself as the Son of God—the true Messiah—the way of salvation. These truths, in their holy and harmonious connexion, are what I mean by the phrase "the doctrine of the Lord." I do not exclude the recorded facts before stated from the doctrine of the Lord, but I conceive that they are not so connected with the holy truths I have specified, as to render it impossible for a man to believe them while he does not belive those holy truths. Indeed, I am personally acquainted with men who believe the Scripture testimony of the facts of the Saviour's death, resurrection, and ascension, who also believe that the remission of sin is no more necessarily connected with the death of Christ, than with the martyrdom of Paul or Peter. Is such a man to be considered as believing to the saving of the soul? Is he to be immersed and received to the fellowship of the christian church, because he declares that he believes Jesus Christ to be the Son of God?

To illustrate my views, let us suppose that the state of Georgia rebels against the general government, and purposes to overthrow the republican and establish a monarchical form. The other states assembled in Congress appoint and send an ambassador, with proper credentials, to protest against this rebellion, to exhort the Georgians to abandon their iniquitous purpose, with assurances of friendship if they comply, and of destruction if they do not. Some deny his official character. Others say, We know that he is an ambassador from the United States, for no man could produce the credentials which he does if he were not. They believe that he is the authorized minister of the general government, and say, "We cannot deny it;" but they do not believe his testimony that it will be best for them to submit; they hate his embassy, and refuse subjection. They believed he came from Washington—that he delivered his message, and that he has returned; they have seen and hated both him and his embassy.

Impotent man has risen in proud rebellion against the infinitely benevolent and almighty Majesty of the Universe. The God of love, though he might in justice have destroyed forever, has sent his beloved Son as his Ambassador from the Court of Heaven to protest against this rebellion, to declare his Father's name, to exhort us to reform and submit to his holy government, and to die for us that God "might be just and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus." Some, by divine favor, believe his testimony of divine truth, reform, are immersed, rejoice, and triumph in the hope of eternal life. Some deny that he came down from heaven, and that he is the Saviour of men. Others are obliged to allow, by the force of the evidence, the testimony that he is "a teacher come from God," that he died and rose again; but they believe not his testimony respecting the holy character of God, the evil of their rebellion, and reject his embassy of truth and mercy.

I am confirmed in my views of this subject by the consideration of the command to "reform and believe the glad tidings." This reformation, which is "towards God," necessarily implies a belief of the holiness or goodness of God's law, and the consequent evil of

sin, without which reformation "*towards God*" is impossible. Also, by the words of our Saviour, "How can ye believe that receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor which cometh from God only" Is it not evident from this forcible question, that the carnal disposition of heart is a barrier to believing to the salvation of the soul? Is it not equally evident that men may, did, and do believe some truths, some facts recorded of Jesus Christ, while they love the praise of men more than the praise of God? [See John xii. 43.]

To this view of the subject it may be objected, that the promise of salvation is connected with believing the resurrection of the Son of God. Rom. x. 9. But if we infer from this that a man believing this may be saved while he does not believe other truths which the Scriptures declare must be believed in order to be saved, we set the Scripture against itself. It is obvious that we must believe *all* truth, the belief of which the New Testament makes essential to salvation; otherwise we might prove that "a man may be forgiven without grace, the blood of Jesus, and without faith, for (as brother Campbell says) we can find passages, many passages, where remission, or justification, sanctification, or some similar term occurs, and no mention of either grace, faith, or the blood of Jesus."

This subject is, in my apprehension, of great importance, both as it respects the true character of the christian church, and the salvation of the souls of men. I know, indeed, and lament that the belief of *too much* truth has been made essential to membership in the church of Christ; let us, however, beware of what is, perhaps, the more dangerous error—making *too little*. Imagine an association of all the persons in any considerable town in the United States, who will confess a belief of the recorded facts of the birth, death, and resurrection of the Messiah. Would such a society be most worthy of the appellation of a church of Christ, or a synagogue of him who confessed the Saviour to be "the Holy One of God?"

Yours in truth and love,

HENRY GREW.

*Hartford, Con.* October 5th, 1830.

---

COPIED FROM THE RELIGIOUS HERALD.

## CONVERSION OF PROFESSOR FRANCKE OF HALLE.

HE had now been seven years engaged in the study of theology, was perfectly familiar with the letter of the Scriptures, and had gone through the routine of studies with uncommon assiduity. At this period, (while yet at Leipsic) it pleased God to give him daily, more and more conviction of his own unworthiness, as well as more and more solicitude to change his situation. But although he was now impressed with a full belief of the necessity and importance of conversion, he found himself so entangled with the things of this world, that he despaired of being able to extricate himself, and lift his affections higher. This exterior difficulty seemed to be removed, when he went to Luneburg. Cut off there from worldly society to

which he was accustomed, and brought into contact with consistent and exemplary christians, he now found that there was an obstacle more serious than mere external circumstances; he felt more than ever the necessity of a change, and the existence of some obstacle with himself to its production. While in this state of mind, he received an appointment to preach in St. John's Church, and finding himself no more disposed to regard the service as a mere exercise in eloquence, he felt deep solicitude so to perform the task as to edify his hearers. He was still engrossed with these thoughts, when he fell upon the text, (John xx. 21.) "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name."

While reflecting on the meaning of these words, and on the difference between imaginary and true faith, the thought occurred to him, that he was himself destitute of this important quality. It was in vain that he endeavored to withstand the strong conviction which now fastened on his soul. It was in vain that he reverted to his books, and even to the Scriptures for relief; he could find it neither in God's word or man's. In the agony of his soul he prayed that if there was indeed a God, he would have compassion on him. While in this state of mind, he resolved, unless some change should occur, to abstain from preaching against his conscience. "For," to borrow his own most expressive terms, "I felt too sensible what it was to have no God upon whom I could lay hold; to bemoan my sins without knowing wherefore, or who it was that caused my tears to flow; or whether there was in reality a God, who was offended with me. In such anguish," he continues, "I knelt down upon that Sunday, and called upon the God and Saviour whom I knew not, and believed not in, for deliverance from this miserable situation, if, indeed, there was a God and Saviour whom I knew not, and believed not in. The Lord heard me, heard me instantly: all my doubts vanished. I was assured in my own heart of the grace of God in Christ. All sorrow and uneasiness departed from me, and I was inundated as with a flood of joy. I had bent my knees in great distress and doubt; I rose again with unutterable confidence and joy. I felt as if through all my past life, I had been lying in a profound sleep, and performed all my actions in a dream, and as if I had now for the first time been awakened; I was perfectly convinced, that all the world, with all its pleasures, could not produce in the human heart, such delicious joy as I experienced, and I saw, distinctly, that after such foretastes of God's grace and goodness, the world with its charms would have little power to allure me." On the Wednesday following, he preached upon the text which he had chosen with great inward satisfaction:—from this hour, Francke dated his conversion, and in this hour, as he himself declared in his last prayer in the garden of the orphan house, forty years afterwards, God opened in his heart, a spring from which exhaustless streams of joy and consolation had been flowing ever since.

*Biblical Repertory.*

REMARKS.

*On the Conversion of Professor Francke.*

WHAT an age of the world is this in which we live! How have sectarianisms and humanisms obscured the light of heaven! What absurdities and wild extravagances are issued from the press, and sent forth to pamper, or to feed, the souls of the bewildered devotees of speculative theology. Here is *the conversion* of a modern Nicodemus told in his own style. Yes, the conversion of a professor in a school for making preachers and teachers of the christian religion! Is it published for the benefit of the religious of this day and generation—a standard for the measurement of christian experience, or is it sent forth as a pun, a satire, on the enthusiasm of this time? I give it as I found it in "The Religious Herald." How many papers have inserted it, I know not. Nor do I know from what motive it was tendered to the readers of the Religious Herald. But it is titled the conversion of a Professor Francke of Halle. And what is the conversion of the professor of which he cherished the remembrance for forty years as his regeneration! *The anguish, the prayer, and the answer to the prayer.* And what was *the anguish?* "whether in reality there was a God who was offended with me?" And what was *the prayer?* Let him tell. "I called upon the God and Saviour whom I knew not, AND BELIEVED NOT IN, for deliverance from this miserable situation, if, indeed, there was a God and Saviour whom I knew not and believed not in"!! The answer to the prayer—"*The Lord heard me.*" What was the proof?—"All my doubts vanished." Yes, here is the conversion of a professor—"the anguish, the pangs of regeneration," the prayer, and the answer. "How shall they call upon him in whom they have not believed?" Paul could not tell: but Professor Francke can tell. "Without faith it is impossible to please God"—said the same Apostle. But Professor Francke without faith pleased God, and was accepted. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is," says the Holy Spirit; but Professor Francke came to God without believing that God is.

It is known that Lord Herbert prayed in the style of Professor Francke, and was confirmed in deism by his prayer. It is said that Volney prayed exactly in the style, and almost in the words of Professor Francke, when the anguish of a sea storm overwhelmed him. Volney's prayer was "O God, if there be any, save my soul, if I have any." Volney was saved from being swallowed up in the ocean. But who will say, that this was Volney's conversion!

The professor *conceited*, however, that God heard him, and this conceit had a happy influence upon him; it operated as a reality. And most certainly it was but a conceit in the first instance: for every christian knows that God will not hear a person without faith. "Let not such a man," says James, "think that he shall obtain any thing from the Lord."

While such stories are told, and believed, and such anguish and prayers are called *conversions*, the world will continue in its present darkness, the scriptures will be neglected, and men will be bewil-

dered with every *ignis fatuus* which rises from the fens and marshes of the irreclaimable wilderness of creeds and systems of human contrivance. We go for this maxim, "*Let God be true*, though it should make every man a liar." "We walk by faith," and not by imaginary conversions. The conversion of the first christians by the Apostles, was a literal turning to God, and doing works worthy of reformation. It was ceasing to do evil, learning to do well. It was washing themselves, making themselves clean in the blood of the Lamb, and forsaking the evil of their doings. The first act of which, was their sensible, visible, memorable burial and resurrection with Jesus Christ in immersion for the remission of sins.

EDITOR.

## CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE—*No. IV.*

THE object of this essay is to account for a difference in degree between the comforts of forgiveness enjoyed by the first converts, contrasted with those now converted to the ancient gospel.

As a preliminary to this, it may be remarked that amongst the moderns, corrupted by human gospels, there is a prevailing idea that persons are pardoned by means of, or in consequence of, a thought or a feeling. Hence, we often hear persons, in relating their experience, date all their joys and their hopes of heaven from some idea which they formed, from some feeling of which they were conscious, or from some impression made upon their minds, at a certain time. Ask such what they know concerning the pardon of their sins, and they generally refer to that idea, feeling, or impression, as proof that they were pardoned. From this, in retrospection, often spring all their confidence and their present joys. Their knowledge of remission is their recollection of such an idea, feeling, or impression. According to its vividness, or faintness, are their present comforts and hopes. If, at any time, their recollections should fail, or the original idea or impression become less vivid, doubts and fears arise; clouds overspread their heaven, gloomy feelings, and religious chills and fevers, disturb their tranquility. But, if the impression, that at a certain time they were truly converted, increase by new experiences, called by them the witness of the Spirit, the first idea, feeling, or impression, augmented by more recent ideas, feelings, and impressions of a similar character, produces a glow intense and a joy unutterable. Still, however, the *fons et principium*, the fountain and origin of all their hopes and joys, is an impression that they were at a certain time pardoned; and, mark what follows, that they were at that time pardoned is an INFERENCE drawn from what passed in their minds. Their feelings were the *premises*, and their pardon is the *conclusion*.

That the fountain and origin of all true peace, hope, and joy is an assurance of the pardon of all sin, and an adoption into God's own family is cheerfully conceded: for this is that for which we contend. But whether this assurance is any *inference* drawn from such premises;—from the workings of a guilty conscience—terrors, con-

victions, feelings, and a subsequent calm, or from the written and well attested testimony of God, received and obeyed, is the great question.

The foundation of this assurance with the ancient converts was the *testimony* of God; with the modern converts to humanized gospels, it appears to be an *inference* drawn from one's own feelings. On testimony true and faithful, the ancients built; on inference the moderns rely. When the controversy is pruned from all verbosity and intricacy, this seems to be the fair and simple state of the case.

The certainty, or the assurance, derived from well attested testimony, and that derived from an inference, especially when that inference is from premises so ambiguous and so intangible as the workings of the mind, is very different. Inferences, drawn from the comparison of propositions respecting things external and sensible, are not to be so much depended on as good human testimony. If a person were to infer the operation of any machine from the most strict examination, the testimony of one competent witness against his inferences will generally make him doubt the correctness of his reasonings and conclusions. But how much less to be depended on are the reasonings of the mind upon itself, when it is both the agent and the subject of examination. Not so the examination of testimony. Its credibility is more easily discovered than the agreement or disagreement of any two propositions respecting the operations of the mind upon itself. But this is a subject on which the experience of every thinking person sheds abundant lustre. To say nothing of the fact that Satan, though the Prince of darkness, often transforms himself into a messenger of light to deceive the human mind, the difficulty in the way of assurance arising from the subtlety of mental operations, makes the goodness of God most illustrious in founding the certainty of remission upon testimony rather than inference drawn from premises so ambiguous as mental impressions and feelings.

When we reflect that all mental comfort, all spiritual health, all peace of mind, hope, and joy, arise from a sense of the friendship and favor of God, or from the knowledge of the remission of our sins, it is most obvious that the clearer the evidence, or the greater the certainty of pardon, the greater the peace, hope, love, and joy of the convert.

To make the christian's joy complete, the Apostles, in imitation of the Saviour, spoke and wrote many things. If, then, the Saviour and his Apostles spoke and wrote for the avowed purpose of making the joy of christians *complete*, it is fairly to be presumed and clearly to be inferred that, in the assurance of remission which the gospel affords, there is a foundation laid for peace and joy complete. The testimony of God is the highest assurance which can be given, and produces the greatest conceivable certainty: for, as John says, "if we receive (as certain) the testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater. But God, willing more abundantly to show to the heirs of his promise the immutability of his purpose, (to bless through

remission all the seed of Abraham) in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have *strong consolation* who have fled for refuge to the Lord Jesus."

To bless the nations through the seed of Abraham was the burthen of God's promise and oath to Abraham. But it was *in*, and not *out*, of Jesus this blessing was to come upon men. Hence, Peter announced in Solomon's Portico:—"To you Jews *first*, God having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to *bless you*, every one of you, in *turning from his iniquities*." From these premises and from this assurance, he exhorted them to be immersed, or to turn to God, that so their sins might be blotted out, and that seasons of refreshment from the presence of God might come upon them.

All that we would infer from these premises is, that the gospel, to correspond with the love and grace which it discovers, to sustain the declared purpose or promise and oath of God concerning blessing the nations in the seed of Abraham, must afford the greatest certainty of remission; and as the object of the apostolic writings was to make the joy of christians complete, and as the completeness of this joy necessarily depends upon the certainty of remission, the gospel ground of assurance of remission to all who embrace it, must, also, be complete.

These things premised, we are prepared for the object of this essay. *The first christians had just the same assurance of the remission of their previous sins as they had that Jesus was the Messiah.* Their assurance that Jesus was the Messiah, was the testimony of God confirmed. Their assurance of remission was the same testimony confirmed and made accessible to them in immersion. Ask one of those converts if his sins were pardoned, he answered, Yes. Ask him how he knew, he replied, *I was immersed in obedience to a divine command for the remission of my sins.* And he that said, "This is my beloved Son," said also, "Believe and be immersed for remission." I believed and was immersed for that purpose upon the same testimony, and, therefore, as certain as I am that Jesus is the Messiah, so certain am I that all my former sins were remitted in immersion. This, at once, explains the *complete joy* of the Pentecostian, Samaritan, and Philippian converts, with all those detailed cases recorded by Luke—with all the disciples in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia Minor, and Bythinia, mentioned by Peter &c. &c. Since the days of Simon, the Pharisee, it has been decided that he that loves much is he that has much forgiven; and he that loves little has but little forgiven, or, what is the same thing, has little evidence that he has been forgiven.

Though many have the same joy in *degree*, as well as in kind, when they are born of water, as had the first christians, all have not. The reasons I now offer, indeed they are substantially presented already. The first christians acted upon testimony only. Those who are now proselyted act from testimony only in part, and from reasoning upon the systems of religious instruction already received. Sometimes the minds of candidates for immersion have been in sus-

pense, in a sort of mental equilibrium, between arguments on both sides, for and against remission in immersion. One single argument has given a preponderance in favor of baptism for remission. From this they act. From inferential reasonings they yield obedience to the gospel. A mind thus trained in vascillations, thus practised in wavering, seldom suddenly, or at all, acts with that certainty and decision which distinguished the first converts. Hence, not acting with the same implicit confidence on God's testimony alone, they cannot have the same immediate assurance of remission, and consequently the same full and complete peace and joy which distinguished the ancient converts.

Again, it may be observed that in the first ages there were no christians, public or private, opposing the promise of remission in immersion. Jews and Pagans, as such, opposed the whole christian institution. But these were regarded as common enemies of the cross. They opposed all the pretensions of Jesus, and all his institutions with like impartial hate. But now many confess Christ in words and professions, who have a reputation for piety, and oppose immersion for remission, and these are a drawback upon young converts, create doubts, suspicions, and fears, so that they cannot come forward with all that assurance and confidence in the institution which the first converts felt. These considerations will explain why it is that some who, surrounded with these unpropitious circumstances, obey for gospel purposes, may not in the same degree rejoice in the Lord as did those immersed by the Apostles.

So soon as these circumstances are removed, and this opposition from professed friends of the gospel is put down, the disciples, apprehending and relying implicitly on the testimony of God, will derive from their immersion that assurance of remission which was the strength and the joy of the apostolic converts. They will, like the Father of the Faithful, learn to rely implicitly upon the testimony of God, and give glory to his faithfulness and power, being fully persuaded that what he has promised he is able to perform. Then will they resemble the children of Abraham who have always been distinguished for faith and obedience, in the consequent confidence in God, and in all its concomitant hopes and joys. Let the disciples have that certainty of remission which the first converts had, and they will, like the first disciples, rejoice with joy unutterable and full of glory. EDITOR.

## PROPHECIES—*No. IV.*

Proposition III.—*At the time of this assemblage of the nations, the Lord Jesus will descend to Mount Olivet, whence he ascended. The Jews will be converted in one day; a literal earthquake will shake the earth from pole to pole; and then will be destroyed the cities of the nations, and all that do wickedly. The Man of Sin shall be judged—the dead saints shall be raised—and the Millennium commence from that day.*

THIS proposition, more comprehensive than the preceding, de-

mands a fuller elucidation, and calls for more particular attention than the first and second. In the present No. we shall devote two essays to it.

The conversion of the Jews cannot be expected by the operation of any means now employed for that purpose. No exertions, made by an apostate church, by a people distinguished for sectarian zeal and an adherence to human traditions, can be honored by God to accomplish such an event. The whole magazines of sectarian artillery furnish not the weapons for such a triumphant war. Their gospels are too impotent; their logic too illogical; their philosophy too unphilosophic, and their arguments too hostile to their own practices, and their practices too repugnant to the religion which they profess, to produce any prejudice in their favor in the hearts of the sons of Abraham.

Christ, proclaimed by a Paul and a Peter, could not subdue the prejudices of the great mass of that people. After the election of grace was separated from the nation, the unbelieving were "all shut up together for their disobedience" to the gospel. "A spirit of deep sleep God gave them, eyes not seeing, and ears not hearing, until the present day." "But God is able to graft them in again." If the casting away of them was the reconciling of the Gentiles, what will the resumption of them be, but life from the dead?" "All Israel shall be saved," when that which is written comes to pass. "The Deliverer shall come out of Zion, and turn away ungodliness from Jacob."

But the children of "Mystery, Babylon the Great," cannot turn away ungodliness from themselves, much less from Jacob. A ruler of a synagogue once said to me:—"You christians talk of the peaceable kingdom of Jesus—show me where the kingdom of love is! Are your discordant sects the conquests of your Messiah! Such a Messiah is worthy of such a people, and such a people worthy of such a Messiah! Whenever you agree in what Jesus taught you, and unite in where and what his kingdom is, then we Jews will hear you. Till then, we will adhere to that Moses who led our fathers through the Red Sea, fed them in the wilderness, and gave us a law from Horeb, received through ranks of angels from God's own hand."

But we have seen they must be restored to their own native-land, and assembled from all nations before they can be converted to Jesus. The nation shall look together upon him whom their fathers pierced. Suddenly he will come in the clouds of heaven, then they all shall say, "Blessed let him be who comes in the name of the Lord!" Then the Deliverer, coming out of Zion, shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.

But here we must notice the accompanying events. For when the Lord Jesus descends to commence his liberal reign on earth, he is to destroy the Man of Sin as well as to convert the Jews. The conversion of the Jews, the destruction of the Man of Sin, and the subjugation of the remnant of the Gentiles to the dominion of Jesus, appear to be almost, if not altogether, contemporaneous events The Man of Sin has been consuming for many years, and will yet be

farther consumed before the Lord appears. The Spirit, or Word, which proceeds out of his mouth, is the instrument by which, Paul informs us, the Man of Sin is to be consumed: but the bright appearing of the Lord at his coming, is that which is appointed to *destroy* him.

The judgment of the great harlot is reserved to that glorious and terrific appearance of the Lord in behalf of the saints amongst the Gentiles, and of his covenant with Abraham his friend. At one and the same crisis, Babylon the Great shall fall, the cities of the Gentiles shall be laid in ruins. The enemies of the Jews shall be destroyed, and the nation converted. In one day the antichristian kingdom in all its provinces—the idolatrous nations of the Gentiles, and the infidelity of the Jews, shall be arraigned and judged. Then it shall be proclaimed by a great voice from the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, IT IS DONE. When the seventh angel pours forth his vial upon the air, "there shall be voices, and thunders, and lightnings, and tempests, and hail, and a great earthquake, such as there had not been from the time that men were upon the earth, such and so great an earthquake." Then it is that God will cause the great harlot to drink the dregs of the cup of the wine of his fiercest wrath.

This great earthquake accompanies the pouring out of the seventh vial, full of the fiercest wrath of God upon the air. The corruptions of christianity deserve the severest punishment. He that corrupted and despised the Mosaic institution, died without mercy when convicted by two witnesses: of how much sorer punishment will the corruptors of christianity be worthy! For them, and their supporters, is reserved the vial of God's fiercest wrath. To this earthquake Ezekiel refers in the section cited in our last number. This is that shock, felt in the land of Israel, which rends the mountains, sinks the vallies, and prostrates the walls and towers to the ground. 'Tis then the Lord descends to Mount Olivet, whence he ascended. Soon as his feet are placed where once he stood, (for says Zechariah, "In that day he shall stand upon the Mount of Olives which is before Jerusalem on the East,") the mountain shall cleave in the midst. Then shall the prediction of the two angels be verified—Acts i. 10, 11. "This same Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven." But, says Malachi, "Who shall abide the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appears; for he is like a refiner's fire, and a fuller's soap. He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver are purged (by fire) that they may offer unto the Lord an offering of righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant to the Lord as in days of old, and as in former years."

"When the Lord's feet touch the Mount of Olives, it shall cleave in the midst towards the East, and towards the West, and there shall be a very great valley, and half of the mountain shall remove towards the North, and half of it towards the South." No person can

allege that this prediction was fulfilled when the Lord came to detroy Jerusalem. At this time, too, it is said, he shall come, and his saints with him. Enoch, who, also, foretold the same event, said, "The Lord will come with ten thousand of his saints." Many of the predictions concerning this coming of the Lord, are either referred to his coming to destroy Jerusalem, or at the end of the world. But to neither event can they properly apply. 'Tis now that "every eye shall see him, and all kindreds wail because of him." At this time the Jews are converted, the dead saints are raised, antichrist is destroyed, the remnant of the Gentiles brought in, and the reign of Jesus commences. But of these things hereafter in detail. Before we prosecute these inquiries farther, we shall subjoin an essay embracing the two periods of christianity as laid down in the sacred books—suffering and triumphant christianity.

DANIEL.

## PROPHECIES—*No. V.*

### CHRISTIANITY IN ITS SUFFERING AND TRIUMPHANT STATES.

WE shall endeavor to sustain the two following propositions from the Holy Scriptures, viz.—

I. The history of Christianity, as it lies on the face of Scripture, is divided into two parts—a suffering and a triumphant part.

II. The kingdom shall be changed from suffering to triumph, not gradually, but immediately—in a day—the day of the Lord—the great day of his wrath.

1st. The termination of the first period of christian history was indicated by the angel when he poured out the last plague—"It is done." The second period commences by the binding of Satan, and the resurrection of the just to live and reign a thousand years with Christ on the earth. The sixth seal concludes the first period and the oppression of the tyrants, the kings of the earth, the great men, and the *rich men*, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman opposed to God. And the seventh trumpet introduces the thousand years when the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. The seals show that christianity was long to be oppressed—the trumpets give a warning to its oppressors—and the vials administer their punishment, because they repented not to give him glory.

Speaking of these two periods, the Apostle Paul says, "I account the *suffering* of the present time not worthy to be compared with the *glory* that is to be revealed in us;" and he shows us that mankind are to be made partakers, if not of the glory, at least of the liberty of the sons of God. Again, "If we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him;" *i. e.* during the thousand years, and afterwards eternally. Peter speaks of the *sufferings* for the Christ, and the *glory* following these; and John says, "Behold, he comes on clouds, and every eye shall see him." This will be at the commencement of the thousand years. But the two periods of christian history were indicated long before by Daniel, when he symbolized it under the figure of a little stone and a

great mountain: "Thou sawest until that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, which smote the image—his feet that were of iron and clay, and broke them to pieces and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth." Daniel also shows that at the beginning of the Millennium, "the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Zechariah says that at that time, "the Lord shall be King over all the earth. In that day there shall be one Lord, and his name one." [See chaps. i. ii, iv. viii. ix. xii. xiii. xiv.] Finally, the Saviour said that the kingdom of heaven resembled a prince who went into a far country to obtain a kingdom, and return. He will return at the beginning of the 1000 years. And the suddenness of his appearance among the nations is set forth in the parable of the Ten Virgins; for as the lightning shines from the East even unto the West, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be; as a snare shall it enclose all the inhabitants of the earth. Watch and pray, therefore, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all those things, and to stand before the Son of Man. The termination of this suffering period of christianity is set forth in the book of Revelation by a most singular symbol of the church. dh. xii. 1. "And there appeared a great wonder in heaven: a woman clothed with the Sun, and the Moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." This woman, afterwards shown to be the church and bride of Christ, is driven by some tyrannical and opposing power into the wilderness: "And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she had a place prepared of God, that they should feed her a thousand two hundred and sixty days." At the end of this period, and near to, or, perhaps, at the very beginning of the thousand years, the woman again makes her appearance, and all the heavens rejoice; yes, when she looketh forth from the wilderness as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners! All the heavens rejoice. "Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great." "Alleluia! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." "Let us rejoice and be glad, and give honor to him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife has made herself ready." In a word, the present suffering period of christianity is to terminate by the most fearful and sweeping judgment that ever desolated the world—on a day called "the great day of God Almighty," "the great day of his wrath," and also "the great and notable day of the Lord." It is on this day that Jesus Christ goeth forth to the punishment of the ungodly nations, with all his saints. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and said to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?"

It will come upon the gluttons of this age sudden as the flood. "Hot ye fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, come, gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God, that you may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, free and bond, both small and great." Here bad government and false religion come for ever to an end, under the extraordinary symbols of a Beast and False Prophet, taken up by the strong-armed angel of God, and "cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." And such shall be the fate of all who dare to act, either in politics or religion, as if there were no God. Brethren, let us reform, and reform, and reform, till we please God in all things; for it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. So much for our first proposition.

That the history of christianity will be changed from suffering to triumph, not *gradually*, but in *a day*, is most manifest to me from various considerations.

In the first instance, I hold it to be incontrovertible that the world, after two thousand years trial, has proved itself incapable of purifying itself, even with all the means for that purpose which God has given to it in the gospel of his Son Jesus Christ. I do not mean, that the gospel is not adequate to the salvation of the world; but that we are unable to apply it to that end. What have we done, what are we doing, or what can we do in Asia, Africa, Europe, or America, with the gospel as it came from the hands of its author? Our missionaries have been all dismissed the Russian empire; and when they were there they did not preach the gospel as the Apostles did; and if they had done so, what would it have availed in an empire where the civil government has anticipated all reform by enlisting against every attempt at change the thousands and tens of thousands of clergymen of the Greek church? England has done the same, and, by her stipends and largesses, has given to the church by law established, such superiority in wealth, literature, rank, and influence, that the word of the Lord is impeded on every hand, nor can it be glorified in the salvation of the British people. It is so in France; it is so also in Spain, Italy, Portugal, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Austria, and other nations in Europe. Asia is one universal sink of Idolatry and Mahometanism. Africa is totally Pagan; and if the original gospel have any thing like fair play in America, it is in these United States. Yet even here the mass of religious instructers do not know how to announce the gospel even in word, saying nothing of their morals and love to God and one another.

2d. Moreover, I think it highly proper that the cause of God should have the ascendancy, and that the opposing institutions of this world should finally be put down by force. The world, in Noah's time, was once served in this manner, before which it refused reformation; and the angels who sinned he cast down to Tartarus, keeping them in chains against the judgment of the great day. He destroyed Pharaoh

also in this manner; besides many others who dared to introduce false religion and bad government into his universe.

3d. I conceive it highly proper that the Messiah should both triumph and reign in the place where he condescended to be put to shame and to suffer; also, that those who, during these two thousand years have suffered for him and for his cause, should be rewarded with him and by him. "We shall reign with thee on the earth." All things, then, conspire to make the coming of Jesus necessary and proper: and now all things are ready; we are now waiting for the opening of that seal which is to rid the world of the tyrants—we now wait for the blast of that final trumpet which is to change the kingdoms, and for the pouring out of that last vial of the wrath of God which is at once to hurl from their ancient foundations all the "cities of the nations," and put an end to both the politics and superstition of the present evil iron age.

That this age shall end, and the Millennium enter in one day, and in only one, seems to me unquestionable from what Zechariah says, xiv. 5. "And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee. And it shall come to pass in *that day*, the light shall not be clear nor dark, but it shall be one day known to the Lord, not day nor night. But it shall come to pass, that at evening time it shall be light." Accordingly John speaks of the destination of the Apostacy as falling out in *one day*. "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire; for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Rev. xviii. In this chapter the suddenness of the catastrophe is noticed no less than four times: First, God declares it; second, the kings of the earth wonder at it; third, the merchants deplore it; and fourth, a mighty angel plunges a great millstone into the sea to symbolize the suddenness, certainty, and completeness of the judgments with which the world will be overwhelmed in *that day—in one hour*. This is the day when, of two men in the field, the one shall be taken and the other left—the day on which the angel shall thrust in his sickle into the earth, and gather the vine of the earth, and cast it into the great wine-press of the wrath of God—the day on which God shall destroy them who have destroyed the earth—"the great and notable day," when the moon shall be turned into darkness, and the sun into blood, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken; and when we shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. All the tribes of the land shall mourn because of him.

The pride of kingdoms, kingdoms themselves, their cities, and the mountains and hills on which they are built, their armies and navies, and all their works of art, shall feel the lighting down of his arm; for on that day he will bathe his sword in heaven and utterly destroy idolatry. "Enter into the rocks and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord and the glory of his majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of man shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in *that day*; for *the day of*

*the Lord of hosts* shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and and upon every one that is lifted up, and he shall be brought low; and upon all the cedars of Lebanon that are high and lifted up, and upon all the oaks of Bashan, and upon all the high mountains, and upon all the hills that are lifted up, and upon every high tower, and upon every fenced wall, and upon all the ships of Tarshish, and upon all pleasant pictures, and the loftiness of men shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be brought low, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day; and the idols he shall utterly abolish. And they shall go into the rocks and into the caverns of the earth for fear of the Lord and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth. In *that day* a man shall cast his idols of silver and idols of gold, which they have made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats, to go into the clefts of the rocks and into the tops of the rugged rocks, for fear of the Lord and for the glory of his majesty when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth. Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?" Reader, take notice! DANIEL.

## HISTORY OF SIN,

### INCLUDING THE OUTLINES OF ANCIENT HISTORY.—NO. VI.

ABOUT fifty years after the retreat of the 10,000, Darius Codomanus ascended the throne, and was destined to be the last of his race, and to seal with his blood the fate of Persia. Another sun was rising in Europe, whose zenith lustre was to eclipse all other luminaries.

The Grecian states had appointed Alexander generalissimo of the army, and his first project was the conquest of the Persian empire. The battle of Granicus was the first blow that was struck, in which the Persians were defeated, and Alexander pushed his march into the heart of the empire.

Alarmed at the progress of the Macedonian conqueror, Darius assembled his forces at Babylon, to the number of 500,000 men, headed them in person, and marched to meet Alexander. The march of this great army was conducted in the usual style of Asiatic monarchs in this day. And as the idea we may obtain of the custom of the age, is curious and important, a short description of the order of Darius' march will not be unacceptable in this place. The sacred fire, borne on five altars, and attended by the magi and three hundred and sixty-five youths dressed in scarlet, preceded the army: then came the chariot of Jupiter, drawn by white horses, and followed by the "Steed of the Sun," splendidly caparisoned. Ten chariots came next, sculptured with gold and silver. Twelve nations, forming the vanguard of the cavalry, then appeared, and were followed by the "Immortal Band," of 10,000 foot, all wearing golden collars and robes, stiff with embroidering and precious stones. Next advanced a body of 15,000, entitled the "King's Relations," sumptuously clothed. Then came Darius, seated on a chariot-throne, supported by the Persian deities, cast in pure gold, and shaded by the spreading wings of a golden eagle. His purple robe was spangled with jewels of surpassing beauty and immense value. He was attended by 200 of his nearest relations, and followed by 10,000 horsemen. The rear of the army, 30,000 foot, came next, and were followed by 400 of the king's horses, led. At some distance behind were Lysigambis, the king's mother, his wives, and female relatives, to the number of nearly 400, in the most costly attire; 600 mules and 300 camels, bearing the royal treasure, and guarded by archers, next approach; and the splendid cavalcade was closed by an immense number of chariots and horses, carrying the ladies of the officers, and attended by companies of light-armed infantry.

Instead of gold and silver, and embroidered robes, the phalanx of Alexander was covered with polished mail from head to foot. Their hardy frames were inured to abstinence and severity of climate, and strangers to the inebriating influence of luxury.

When Alexander heard that Darius had arrived at the city of Issus he hastened to meet him. A battle was fought. The close order and heavy armor of the Macedonian phalanx gave them so decidedly the advantage, that the Persians were soon routed, and all resistance ceased, except from some Greek auxiliaries, who firmly stood their ground, till from twenty, they were reduced to eight thousand. Then they retreated and returned home, leaving Alexander sole master of the field. Darius fled; his camp and family fell into the hands of the victor. The cities of Damascus, Gaza, Susa, and Persepolis, containing the treasures of the crown, were taken.

The unfortunate Darius, after many attempts to retrieve himself, was obliged to take refuge in Media, whither he was pursued by Alexander. Bessus, the general of Darius, thinking to purchase the favor of Alexander, treacherously assassinated his royal benefactor, and left him "weltering in his blood."

Thus perished Darius Codomanus, in the sixth year of his reign, B. C. 330, and with him fell the empire of the Medes and Persians, which had continued, from the accession of Cyrus, 204 years.

The government, arts, sciences, manners, customs, and antiquities of the Persians, are next to be considered. We shall make a few observations upon each in their order.

1. The strenuous administration which was established by Cyrus had too much influence upon the internal constitution of the empire to be materially altered by the weakness and extravagance of his successors. The establishment of regular posts and couriers, attributed to Cyrus, rendered the conveyance of intelligence over that vast empire rapid and certain. By this means rebellions were quickly crushed, conspiracies easily frustrated, and the conduct of satraps, or governors, more open to cognizance. The crown was hereditary, always descending to the eldest son. The prerogative of the king was absolute. Secluded from the eyes of the vulgar, he was generally reverenced as a deity, and his commands, however unjust, cruel, or extravagant, had the authority of law, as well as the sanction of a religious obligation.

2. The Persians seem never to have been a very enterprising people. Their contempt for commerce rendered it impossible for them ever to derive the benefits of foreign improvement; and, consequently, their progress in the fine arts, which the Greeks were carrying rapidly to perfection, was either very slow or perfectly stationary. They have in all ages been celebrated for some kinds of manufacture, particularly the making of gold thread, embroidery, and leather. Their carpets, at this day, cover the floors of the rich in all parts of the world. But in the higher branches of manufacture they have never excelled, and are said, by travellers, at the present day to be almost entirely ignorant of painting.

They were an agricultural people, and before the fall of Babylon so poor that they had no clothing but skins, no drink but water, and no medium of exchange but the produce of the earth. Gold was first coined by Cyaxares, the cotemporary of Cyrus, and by Darius, whence thin pieces of money were called darics. But after the conquest of Assyria, which had for centuries been the seat of luxury, the Persians began to wrap their hardy bodies in silk and embroidered garments, till, under the last of their monarchs, they had utterly lost the spirit of the sentiment, that "virtuous poverty is better than vice loaded with diamonds." Those arts which advance, were supplanted by those which destroy a nation.

3. The Persians, before the days of Zoroaster, who lived in the reign of Darius Hystaspes, were generally ignorant in the extreme. Even the magi, who were the doctors of the nation, were confined to some vague opinions in philosophy and astronomy, together with the precepts of the then prevalent religion.

4. The Persians were moderate in their eating, but always drank to excess. They were remarkably attached to their friends; and ingratitude was considered one of the most heinous crimes, being punished by the laws in the severest manner. This excellent practice has been peculiar to them. They always have been the most polished people of all the East, and their hospitality to strangers is very remarkable. A stranger can hardly insult a Persian more than by leaving his house without eating and drinking; for they suppose that for every entertainment they give to a stranger, Oromasdes commissions a blessing to rest upon their family. Their usual mode of salutation, if the persons were of equal rank, was a kiss upon the lips; if one were a little inferior, upon the cheek. The common people always prostrated themselves before the nobility. The Persians may be said to have been, emphatically, a ceremonious people, the strictest attention being always paid to every punctilio between relatives and friends, as well as strangers. All their important transactions were replete with ceremony.

5. There remain to this day some of the noblest specimens of architecture in Persia that the world affords. The majestic ruins of Palmyra and Persepolis testify, in strong language, the power, perseverance, and grandeur of the nations which once peopled the plains of Asia. Irregular masses of huge stones, marble porticoes, covered with sculptured ornaments, with here and there the broken shaft of a lofty pillar, are all that remain of those stupendous edifices which seemed destined to endure when thousands of generations should have rolled away. The palace of Persepolis, one of the noblest structures ever reared, at the instigation of Thais, a celebrated courtezan, was burnt in a fit of intoxication by Alexander the Great. Two pillars of beautiful fluted marble, fourteen feet in circumference, and fifty-four feet high, adorned with specimens of exquisite sculpture, are still standing before the mouldering, formless ruins of the palace. "Why dost thou build the hall, son of the winged days? Yet a few years, the blast of the desert comes and howls in thy empty court."

The prevalent religion of Persia, before Zoroaster, their prophet and reformer, is usually known by the name of magiism, or the worship of God under the symbol of fire. It originated in Persia and spread into India. The religion of Assyria was sabiism, or the worship of the host of heaven, under the symbols of images. Sabiism at different times gained some footing in Persia, but could never overcome their abhorrence of abasing the Deity by a representation of him under any image except fire, which they deemed the purest and simplest element.

After the death of Smerdis, the magian and usurper, the successor of Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, the magian religion fell into disrepute, and was gradually losing ground in Persia, when it was again revived by one of the most extraordinary men that ever appeared. Zerdusht, or, as he is called by the Greeks, Zoroaster, the founder, or rather the restorer of the magian religion. The result of the researches of the greatest orientalists, respecting the life and character of this remarkable personage is as follows:—

He was a Jew, born in Palestine, and for several years served in the capacity of a servant to one of the prophets who were carried to Babylon in the captivity of Nebuchadnezzar. Prideaux supposes that it was the Prophet Daniel with whom he lived. In this manner he became thoroughly acquainted, not only with the general scheme of the Jewish religion, as taught in the Pentateuch, being born and educated in it, but likewise with the spirit and purity of that religion, as professed and practised by his master Daniel. Endued by nature with a mind capable of embracing the most extensive views, and with learning and subtlety sufficient to carry those views into full effect, he aspired to secure to himself, by the pretence of a prophetic mission, a reputation and dignity similar to that which Daniel possessed. Accordingly he retired from the world, and lived for many years in a cave, where he pretended to have received revelations, and to have been instructed in the doctrines and ceremonies of the religion he was about to establish. Here he composed the Zendavesta, or magian

Bible, comprising 12 volumes of 100 skins of vellum each. The word Zendavesta signifies "a tinder box." This book, containing articles of faith and practice, together with the life of the author, Zoroaster feigned to have received from heaven. They say that the prophet, in a vision, was taken into the expanse of heaven, where he saw the empyreal circle, diffusing an interminable lustre; from the midst of which Oromasdes talked with him, gave him the holy Zendavesta, and the eternal fire to burn upon his altar.

After having matured his plan, Zoroaster made his appearance at Echatana, in Media, which had always been the principal seat of the magian religion, in the reign of Darius Hystaspes. Although the magian religion had fallen into disgrace among the nobility, yet the prejudice of the people, confirmed by long habit, was in its favor, and was the foundation of Zoroaster's scheme. A better one he could not have chosen. His first innovations respected their faith. They had been accustomed to believing that two eternal principles of good and evil existed, and were contending for the government of the world. But Zoroaster taught them that there was but one God, "incorruptible, eternal, and unbegotten; the author of all good, the most excellent of all beings, and the wisest of all intelligent natures; the father of equity, the parent of good laws, self-instructed, self-sufficient, and the first former of nature." That there are two powerful intelligences—the one light, which is the author of good; the other darkness, which is the author of evil. That in this world, these two angels are contending for the victory; but there will arrive a day of judgment, in which the angel of darkness shall be driven with his followers into a region of darkness and misery, to suffer everlasting torments for their evil deeds. But, that the angel of light shall go, with his followers, to dwell forever in that pure light and joy which eternally emanates from the burning throne of Oromasdes.

Another alteration which Zoroaster effected was the creation of the fire temples, in which worship was to be performed. Before his time the Persians had always paid their devotions in the open air, on the tops of mountains, and in solitary places, because they thought it derogatory to the majesty of heaven to suppose Oromasdes circumscribed by temples. But Zoroaster, by convincing them that though Oromasdes was not confined to any place, yet it was absolutely necessary to have a temple—In order to preserve the sacred fire, the symbol or shadow of Deity, which he had brought from heaven, from being extinguished by any casualty, they erected pyrea, or fire temples, all over the empire, and have them to this day.

To give you some idea of their practical rules, I have transcribed the five grand precepts of the Zendavesta, which they consider ought to govern the conduct of every individual:—

1. To have shame ever with them, as a remedy against sin; for a man would never oppress his inferiors if he had any shame; a man would never steal if he had any shame; a man would never lie if he had any shame. But because this is laid aside, men are ready to commit any crimes.

2. To have fear always present with them; and that every time the eye twinkled, or closed its lids together, that they should stand in fear lest they should not go to heaven,

3. That whensoever they are to do any thing, to think whether the thing be good or bad—whether commanded or forbidden in the Zendavesta.

4. That whatsoever of God's creatures they should first behold in the morning, it should be a monitor to put them in mind of their thanksgivings to Oromasdes, that had given such good things for men's use.

5. That whensoever they pray by day, they should turn their faces towards the Sun; and when by night, towards the Moon, for these were Oromasdes' witnesses, most contrary to Lucifer, who loveth darkness more than light.

The Persian empire rose suddenly, and fell as suddenly. Instead of toiling through a long, tempestuous, and feeble infancy, like most other nations, it broke into existence like Pallas from the brain of Jupiter, in full armor, strength and beauty. Led by Cyrus, a mild and vivifying sun, it flourished, the envy

and admiration of the world; till, at length, as in a moment, it withered and perished beneath the scorching influence of another sun which suddenly appeared, flaming in the western hemisphere. The wild hero of Macedon swept these fair regions with the besom of destruction, and for a season the praises of Cyrus were drowned in the fame of Alexander the Great.

[*Whelpley's Lectures.*]

*From the Christian Examiner.*

AS the prejudices and antipathies of the Baptists have been aroused and are at work against all that we say or do, (though Christ or Paul has taken the lead in the matter,) and knowing that the opinions or examples of great and distinguished men are of incalculably greater weight than those of an obscure individual, we present them with the thoughts of the celebrated ABRAHAM BOOTH on the popular method of preaching. His name is familiar to most of our readers, who know that he stood pre-eminent among the Baptists both of Europe and America. He was the author of "the Reign of Grace," the "Pedobaptism Examined," an "Essay on the Kingdom of Christ," and several other works. In the last named work, (p. 60—65,) he says—

"Some of different communions, have deliberately acted as if the preacher's work were a mere trial of skill, and as if a pulpit were the stage of a harlequin. To display the fertility of their invention, they have selected for texts mere scraps of scripture language; which, so far from containing complete propositions, have not, in their dislocated state, conveyed a single idea. Upon these they have harangued, while the ignorant multitude have been greatly surprized that the preacher could find so much where common capacities perceived nothing. Sometimes these men of genius will choose passages of scripture expressive of plain historical fact, which have no connexion with the great work of salvation by Jesus Christ; and handle them (not professedly by way of accommodation, for then it might be admitted) but as if they were *sacred allegories*. Such historical facts being "spiritualized," as they love to call it, doctrines, privileges, duties, in abundance, are easily derived from them. Nay, so ingenious are preachers of this turn, that it is no hard matter for them to find a great part of their creed in almost any text they take. Thus they allegorize common sense into pious absurdity. It might, perhaps, be too barefaced, though it would certainly suit the vanity of such preachers were they frequently to address their hearers on the pronominal monosyllable *I*; and there are two passages of sacred writ where it occurs in the most apposite manner. The former would make an admirable text; the latter, a noble conclusion: and they are as follows: "Such a man as *I*—Is "not this great Babylon that *I* have built?" Others, and often the same persons, frequently use the gestures of the theatre, and the language of a mountebank, as if their business were to amuse, to entertain, and to make their hearers laugh. Extravagant attitudes and quaint expressions, idle stories and similes quite ludicrous, appear in abundance, and constitute no small part of the entertainment furnished by such characters. But in what a state must the consciences of those preachers be, who can deliberately and with premeditation act in this manner! Or, what must we think of their petitions for divine assistance, in addressing the people when they intend thus to treat them! I called it *entertainment;* and, surely, they themselves do not consider it in a religious point of light. For can any man, who is not insane, deliberately adopt measures of this kind, when really aiming, either to produce, or to promote, a devotional and heavenly temper in the hearts of his hearers? Yet that is the general end of preaching. Or can the preacher have any devotion, while showing the airs of a mountebank; and when, if the bulk of his auditory had no more decency than himself, there would be a burst of laughter throughout the assembly? Whatever such declaimers may think, where there is no solemnity there is no devotion; and, we may venture to add, that a person habitually destitute of devotion in his own heart, while pretending

to teach others the doctrine of Christ, is a wretched character in the sight of God, and has reason to tremble. Such a man serves not our Lord Jesus Christ, but his own interests, in some form or other. He may wish for popularity, and perhaps may obtain it from the ignorant multitude; but people of sense and of piety will consider him as disgracing his office, as affronting their understandings, and as insulting the majesty of that Divine Presence in which he stands. For where upon earth are we to expect solemnity, if not in the pulpit? There a man should be serious and solemn as death.

"It may, perhaps, be said, 'This kind of trifling has its use. It is a mean of exciting curiosity, and of drawing many to hear the gospel who might not otherwise have the least inclination so to do.' Such, I presume, is the chief reason by which preachers of this cast endeavor to justify themselves at the bar of their own consciences. In answer to which, a repetition of that capital saying, "My kingdom is not of this world," might be sufficient: for that must be a wretched cause, even of a secular kind, which needs buffoonery to support it. To trifle in the service of God, is to be profane. It is, therefore, an impious kind of trifling: and *and shall we do evil that good may come?* Through the interference of Providence, and the sovereign grace of God, various instances of enormous wickedness have issued in the highest good to mankind. Of this we have undoubted evidence in the selling of Joseph by his envious brethren. We have a still more striking instance in the death of Christ, through the treachery of Judas and malice of the Jews. Nay, persecution has *frequently* been an occasion of spreading the gospel; yet few, I take it for granted, have persecuted for that end, or attempted to justify the practice upon that principle. Were the farcical conduct, here censured, lawful, there would be reason to think that the cause of Christ and the interests of a harlequin are very nearly allied, because the same kind of means is adapted to promote them."

Mr G. Gregory, when animadverting on the conduct which is here censured, says, "It is dangerous on any occasion to depart from the plain track of common sense, and there is no attempt at ingenuity so easy as that which borders upon nonsense. It is one of the mean artifices of barren genius, to surprize the audience with a text consisting of one or two words. I have heard of a person of this description, who preached from "*Jehovah Jireh*," and another, from the monosyllable "*But.*" These are contemptible devices, more adapted to the moving theatre of the mountebank than to the pulpit, and can only serve to captivate the meanest and most ignorant of the vulgar."

## LETTERS TO HUMPHREY MARSHAL, Esq.—*No. I.*

SIR,

IN the bustle of controversy with the sects professing the christian faith, we have had neither room nor leisure to notice either the sayings or doings of the adversaries of that faith. Since the publication of the debate with Mr. Owen on the evidences of christianity, we have not seen any thing written by any of the sceptics of this country worthy of notice; because, in our judgment, already refuted in that work; nor have we seen a single sentence against the Debate from any pen, save the letter which you have written to me on that subject; with what honor to yourself as a gentleman, a senator, a logician, we shall leave others to decide. I was favored with a copy of your letter in the month of May last, while attending a meeting in May's Lick. I hastily glanced over it, while ascending the Ohio in a steam-boat, and have just now, for the second time, finished the reading of it.

I have no doubt. sir, but you have strong objections to the truth of the christian religion, much stronger than you have either reason

or argument to sustain. For Free-thinkers are not more free from prejudice and passion, from enthusiasm and infatuation, than those whom they denounce as dupes and impostors. With many of them, a *Free-thinker* is one who is free to form opinions as despots enact laws; free to infer without premises; free to conjecture without probability; free to assert and to decide, not only without, but even against, reason and well established testimony. Those who are not so free in these respects, they rank amongst impostors and dupes. These they honor with such epithets as you bestow on Paul. In your style Paul was a "jack-with-the-lantern;" the Apostles were "cullies," and the most honorable women were "gossips." The christian facts are "abominable falsehoods;" and the writings of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, are "apostolic romances." In this style, sir, you appear not to be a *novitiate*, but a *master*.

It is not improbable but that as he that invents and often repeats a falsehood, finally believes it himself; so some who have reason to fear the truth of revelation, from long wishing it to be false, come to think that it is all a cunning devised fable. At all events, many are strongly prejudiced against certain truths, on account of the aspect in which they stand to themselves; and while no evidence can assure them of their truth, they adhere to imaginations of their own with more tenacity than a mathematician to a theorum which he has fully demonstrated. I should not, sir, make these remarks if I thought them wholly impertinent as regards yourself. When I see you reason against the accumulated weight of evidences, from all sources, in attestation of the resurrection of Jesus from the grave, without even an air of plausibility; and see you assume, as a truth, *"that the dead body of Jesus was taken from the sepulchre by Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus who deposited it there* FOR THE PURPOSE *of removal"*—must I not suppose that some passion, or prejudice, beclouds your reason? On any other subject, I doubt not, you would hold up to ridicule the person, who, pretending to reason about *facts*, would make such an assumption, and go on to assert concerning the *purposes, or motives*, of the persons impugned.

Jesus, too, with you, *"himself was an adventurer for the Messiahship with a design but half digested—half formed."* In the midst of all this incredulity and enthusiasm, there appears a little faith. You, sir, then, believe in the Messiahship of the Jews;—that such was the expectation of the nation resulting from their prophecies. So strong is your faith, too, in this Messiahship, that you believe Jesus was an adventurer for it. I think, were you to examine the grounds and reasons of this your faith, you will find youself judged and condemned by your own reasonings for rejecting this adventurer.

But while on the subject of faith, I cannot but remark how much it is a faith *sui generis*. You believe and disbelieve what you please. You believe that "Paul had an apoplectic fit on his way to Damascus," probably "inflamed by wine"—(*probably!*) but certainly!—"hot enough without it to construe this attack of apoplexy into a vision of Jesus Christ." You believe that Nicodemus and Joseph

the senator had the body deposited for the purpose of removal. You assert in the following words:—"I say that Mary Magalene was the *author of the resurrection of Jesus Christ*, by making the first suggestions of the fact, and by adding to it circumstances of a marvellous kind."

Indeed, sir, you appear to be as *free* a reasoner, as thinker, or believer, touching all matters and things pertaining to the resurrection of Jesus. The freest piece of reasoning, which I recollect to have seen from the pen of a senator, is your reasoning about the robbery of the sepulchre. At the conclusion of your reasoning, you affirm—"I have now shown how, or by whom, the body of Jesus was removed from the sepulchre." Now for your *showing* by *testimony* and *reason*. Nay, indeed, you prove a fact, historic, too, without testimony. For the only testimony you adduce is your own conjecture. And your deposition is to the following effect:—"The Apostles were hypocrites." Joseph and Nicodemus, two of the disciples, stole the body. This is proved from the fact that Joseph and Nicodemus were not interrogated about its absence. The Apostles knew they had stolen it, and therefore would not have them interrogated; and they, Joseph and Nicodemus, conscious of having stolen it, did not interrogate the Apostles about it. Had they not had the body in custody, they would doubtless have called upon the Apostles to account for its absence. And how is it proved that they did not interrogate the Apostles? Because it is not recorded! "The fair inference from this *silence* is *as strong and as plain as the war-toned trumpet*, in affirming that *no inquiry was made*. "And that in like manner affirms, *that knowing how the body was disposed of*, they had no inquiry to make; or rather that they chose not to write it down if they made any. Such, had it been told, would have been the honest truth." Thank you, Mr. Marshal, for your *deposition*. But this is more than your testimony—it is your reasoning and testimony combined. This you call "*showing* by whom the body of Jesus was removed." I know of no christian writer who ever demanded more credulity from his readers than you demand in this instance. This vies with the popish transubstantiation! Silence has not, as far as I have learned, ever before been summoned as a witness in any case, and made speak "louder than the war-toned trumpet." This is a new court, new judges, witnesses, and jury—one erected by Mr. Marshal for his own use and behoof. Now, sir, think you that a *sane* community will consent to such a tribunal, or that it can regard that man as possessing a sound mind in a sound body who would attempt—I say, attempt to subvert the faith of the most intelligent portion of the human race by such chimerical assumptions, and call it "*showing* by whom the body of Jesus was removed"!!

I shall only, in these introductory notices, attend to another of your proofs that the body was stolen. You inform us that Mary Magdalene was the author of the report of the resurrection, and yet the same writer who informs you of Mary Magdalene affirms that her report was not even believed by the disciples themselves. From

what history, then, sir, do you learn that she was the author of the resurrection story? But your records inform you of a grand "*caucus*" held the night between the first and second days of the report and of the week, touching this report. The proceedings of said caucus you are also apprized of. The debates you have read, well attested, and on the question "whether to *suppress* or to propagate the idea of their late Master's resurrection, the latter had the majority." If I do not forget what I have read in your pamphlet, I think you talk of the inductive philosophy, and the rules of evidence, testimony, &c. And is this your application of them? Is it by such reasonings, assumptions, and conjectures you propose to undermine the faith of christendom! If so, indeed, you appear to have as much underrated the intelligence and the intellect itself of this generation as you have the evidences of the christian religion. But the scoffer will rejoice with you in all the puns, witticisms, and scoffs which you bestow on the Author of the hope of immortality. They also, whose interest it would be that there were no God, will say, 'Well done, good and faithful servant.' But as you assume to *reason* against the evidences of the great fact on which christianity rests, and as you make a great a-do about the contradictions of the original witnesses, I will attend to the marrow and pith of your reasonings, to show that the original witnesses were wittingly and knowingly a pack of impostors, lying and propagating lies for the express purpose of carrying some point, which you, however, cannot name. We shall, nevertheless, calmly and dispassionately examine your "*reasons*," if such they may be called, by which you would disprove the fact of Christ's resurrection.

You seem to have reasoned yourself into the conviction that you have attacked the main point of my argument in support of the resurrection of Jesus. This, however, is not the fact. You have not even glanced at it. The testimony of the original witnesses is no where in your pamphlet submitted, presented, nor attacked with any reference to that which gives validity to the whole of it. You rely upon the contradictions which you have imagined you have found in the narratives of the Evangelists. And because they did not tell all the same incidents, nor those which they relate, in the *same words*, you prove them to be incredible witnesses, and the gospel to be a fiction. How successful you have been in finding *contradictions* the sequel will disclose.

The christian religion has been attacked and defended by all sorts of intellects and by all sorts of men. It never sustained an injury from its enemies. Its friends—its *professed* friends, have always been its worst enemies. Its *real* friends have nothing to fear from such attacks as you volunteer in the pamphlet before me. You fail to console even the Deists. And I have so much knowledge of human nature as to authorize me to say, that even those who wield as able a pen as yourself are unable to deface from their own minds the fears and apprehensions that Jesus rose from the dead. It is among the most common phenomena of the human mind to find persons pleading a cause which they do not believe, and to see others discrediting both

facts and pretensions, which, with all their efforts, they cannot cordially disbelieve themselves. How far this may be true of yourself I have no business to inquire. You have in your old days, at the close of a pretty long life, thought good to leave behind you a monument of your hatred against the Author of the Christian Religion, and those who sustained his pretensions at the hazard of their lives.

It is a consolation which you promise yourself in death, the most unenviable, that not having found the present world more religious nor moral than to make it safe to live in, you put forth all your powers and all your influence, your last and best efforts, to rob the christian of his hope in God, and to weaken all that restrains the arm of violence and the heart of wickedness, by denying the facts on which that purest and best of all systems of morality and virtue rests; and by offering in its place not a single ray of light or information on all that most interests man to know, viz. what he is, whence he came, and whither he goes.

EDITOR.

## REGENERATION—*No. VII.*

IT has been observed by some writers that man is distinguished from the rest of the animal creation more by *religion* than by *reason*. Instinct, they argue, produces actions so nearly resembling those dictated by reason, that it is sometimes difficult, and perhaps impossible, to discriminate between them: but in the whole range of its operations we are presented with nothing which is at all analogous to devotional exercise, or claims the least degree of affinity to religion. Pitching upon this, therefore, as the peculiar characteristic of the human family, man has been emphatically styled "*a religious animal.*"

Although it be true that devotion, as contradistinguished from reason, is the most eminent trait of human character, it is not easy to perceive the propriety of placing them in opposition, and extolling the one at the expense of the other; since religion owes its existence to reason, and should be considered its crown of glory rather than its rival. It is the result of the conclusions and deductions of reason from revelations made to the senses, and is to be viewed as being the point in which intellect most conspicuously displays its superiority, and not as a distinct and peculiar principle.

It would follow, then, that as man, under the influence of reason, properly directed, becomes religious; in the same degree will his character be exalted, and the line of distinction between him and the brute creation be more strongly marked: and that in proportion as he is irreligious, his distinguishing attribute is lost, and he approaches more nearly in his character the beast that perishes.

That reason enables man to discover from the material universe the existence and power of God is abundantly evident. If, like Aristotle, we suppose a man to be brought up from infancy in a subterraneous abode where he has been conversant with the various works of art, and has learned by experience that what is made must

have had a maker; that every design must have had a designer; every contrivance, a contriver: if we then imagine him to be brought up into the light of day, and to discover creation unfolding its charms before him—the glorious sun enlivening nature with his grateful beams—the pleasant fruits adapted to his taste—the lovely flowers—the ten thousand delightful objects which would burst upon his senses, all intended for a particular use, all eminently fitted for that for which they were intended: all exhibiting marks of the most exquisite contrivance and ingenuity, so far excelling human skill as to defy imitation, and all bearing the impress of the same author; would he not be irresistibly compelled by the conclusions of reason founded upon experience to attribute the existence, order, beauty, greatness, and sublimity of the works of creation to such a being as we suppose God to be? Undoubtedly such would be the result; and, indeed, seeing that all the ideas of which man is possessed are derived originally from objects presented to the senses, we cannot possibly conceive of any thing better fitted than the material creation to reveal to human reason the power and the existence of God. The groves are vocal. The hills and vallies, "the cloud-capt mountain and the shaggy heath," the painted birds, the creatures of his hand, the monsters that swim in the deep waters, utter forth a glorious voice, and lead the beholder to exclaim in the language of the poet—

*"These are thy glorious works, Parent of Good!*
*Almighty! thine this universal frame,*
*Thus wondrous fair! Thyself how wondrous then!*
*Unspeakable! who sitt'st above these heav'ns*
*To us invisible, or dimly seen*
*In these thy lowest works; yet these declare*
*Thy goodness beyond thought and power divine."*

The conduct of the Gentiles in neglecting to glorify God, the Apostle Paul declares to have been without excuse. "Because (says he) that which may be known of God is manifest among them, for God has manifested it to them, (for his invisible things, even his eternal power and divinity, since the creation of the world are clearly seen, when thought upon, by the things that are made) so that they are inexcusable." And when the Lycaonians, recognizing the divine power in the cure of the lame man, were about to offer sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas, these brethren, indignant at their idolatrous disposition, in endeavoring to turn them from the worship of dead idols to the living God, directed their attention to him by an appeal to those manifestations of his power and goodness with which they were already acquainted. He it was, they declared, "who made the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and all things which are in them; who in former generations permitted all the nations to walk in their own ways, though he did not leave himself without witness, doing good, and giving us showers of rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." "The heavens," says David, "declare his glory, the starry canopy displays his workmanship. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not

heard. Their line has gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world."

But man discovers God's power and existence not only in the creation, but in the preservation of the world. He perceives that all things are conducted according to a regular and unchangeable plan, and that under similar circumstances the same causes will always produce the same effects. From these observations he deduces what he calls "the laws of nature." Finding himself unable to interfere with the fixed operations of these laws without power to stay the Sun in the zenith—to restrain the tides of the ocean—to interrupt the tempest in its wild career—to stop the march of Time, or change the course of the seasons; he is convinced that he has no control over them; that, on the contrary, he himself is entirely under their dominion; that the administration of them is in the hands of God, and that the power which can change and reverse them at pleasure must come from him.

We have stated that the first step towards the renovation of mankind, consisted in exhibiting to man the glories and excellencies of the divine character. Seeing, then, that the existence, power, and goodness of God have been disclosed to all men by the things that are made, before we enter upon the consideration of the manner in which he has more fully revealed himself, we will premise that, in doing so, we might reasonably expect him to introduce himself to the notice of men by means of those attributes which they already acknowledged to appertain to him.

Since the fall, man has not often been directly addressed by his Creator. Though once familiarized with his voice, he remembers it no more; or guilt causes him to tremble at its sound. He knew it in Eden, and fear taught him to conceal himself among the trees of the garden. When addressed at Sinai, in a manner comporting so well with what was already known of the majesty and power of God as to enable them to recognize his voice, the Israelites entreated that he might not speak with them any more "lest they should die." And when he spoke on other occasions, without any accompanying manifestations of his presence, they knew not his voice. Some said, "It thundered;" others said, "A heavenly messenger spoke." "Did you never hear his voice, (said the Saviour,) or see his form? Or have you forgotten his declaration that you believe not him whom he has commissioned?"

Our Heavenly Father, exhibiting both in matter and manner of the revelation his compassionate condescension towards the human family, designs to communicate his will by a human voice and in the likeness of man. Having in former ages addressed the fathers by the prophets, in these latter days the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, has revealed him. Professing to have been sent by the Governor of the universe, they received from him a letter of introduction to evince the truth of his pretensions. "The works which the Father has empowered me to perform, the works themselves which I do (says Jesus) testify that the Father has sent me." Having

been begotten of God and born of Mary, he had no sooner died to all earthly relationship and been born of water, than he was publicly acknowledged as the Son of God, and, as such, announced to the Jews on Jordan's banks. Entering immediately upon the work which the Father had given him to do, he glorified God upon the earth in all his words and actions. Meek and lowly, and acquainted with grief, he came unto his own, and though his own received him not, he bore with patience the scorn of those who received continually his favors. Full of compassion and of gentleness, he wept with those who wept, and rejoiced with those who rejoiced; he could not suffer the hungry to depart from him without satisfying their wants; he healed the sick, the blind, the lame, and at his bidding the dead arose from the silent tomb. Even the winds and the sea obeyed him, and while in his actions he displayed the power, wisdom, and goodness of God, while he went about doing good, he revealed to man a secret relative to the love of God, so wonderful, so far beyond all human expectation as to beat down the weapons of rebellion, to pierce the bosom of the stoutest foe, and lead the willing bands in grateful chains. The gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the glad tidings that God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believed in him should not perish, but have everlasting life; the proclamation of forgiveness and never ending happiness to the wretched and guilty sons of men through the atonement of the Son of God, completes that overwhelming exhibition of God's philanthropy which is calculated to soften the hardest heart, and becomes the power of God unto salvation to every one who believes it.

The Apostles of Christ believed in him upon the testimony of their senses. They could not be deceived. They witnessed his miracles, his death, his resurrection. Their eyes had seen, and their hands had handled that Word of Life which was with the Father, and was manifested to men. Their convictions were not upon *faith*, but *knowledge*. In order to be witnesses, it was necessary that they should have actually seen the occurrence of the facts. The Apostle Paul appeals to his having *seen* the Lord as one of the proofs of his apostleship, and these witnesses, proclaiming the glad news throughout the world, were favored with those displays of that power of God which were necessary to introduce them in their true character to the notice of men. The gospel came, not depending upon the words of men's wisdom, but with demonstrations of the Spirit and with power. This great salvation, which began to be spoken by the Lord, was confirmed to men by those that heard him, God bearing joint witness, both by signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and distributions of the Holy Spirit, according to his own pleasure. It is called the Word of God, the incorruptible seed of the Word, of which the children of God are born, and "this is that Word," says Peter, "which has been proclaimed as glad tidings to you." "Belief comes by hearing, and this hearing by the word of God." Upon the testimony of the witnesses who proclaim the gospel our faith is founded.

As they testify what they have seen and heard, we receive their testimony. We see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and are enabled, through the obedience of this faith founded upon the testimony of the Apostles and Prophets of Jesus Christ, to rejoice in him, though we see him not, with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

DISCIPULUS.

---

*Essex, Va. Sept. 17th,* 1830.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

IN the last Harbinger Bishop Semple has seen cause to make some insinuations and assertions, to which I feel myself in duty bound to reply—I, therefore, hope you will grant me the privilege of defending myself, by giving place in your next Harbinger to the following letter addressed to him:—

## TO BISHOP ROBERT B. SEMPLE.

BROTHER SEMPLE,

*Dear Sir*—I REGRET to see in the 8th No. of the Harbinger, at the close of your letter to brother Campbell, certain insinuations and assertions which every reader that knows any thing of the circumstances, will believe were intended for me—I repeat it, I am sorry that you have laid me under the necessity of repelling your *personal attack*, and that publicly. This is not the first time you, in the plenitude of your mercy, have thrown a dart at me. You have condescended to call me a pious father in one breath, and almost in the next, have impeached my veracity. Such piety as this, brother Semple, I abhor. It behoves me now to sustain my assertions, or acknowledge my error. This is the course that ought to be pursued by every honest high minded christian. I say high minded, because if a christian have not *independence* enough to speak the truth, and maintain it, he is unworthy to be called a disciple of King Messiah; or, should he have erred, have not *honesty* enough to confess his errors, when told of them, he is, at best, a whited sepulchre.

I will now take a concise review of what you have insinuated and said. In order to your making your attack not directly, you have complained of certain things published by brother Campbell, "These tales, I suspect, all came from the same quarter." As respects the sermon of the oyster-man, you know that it is a fact, or ought to know it, being once Pastor of the church where it was preached. The preacher is your right hand man, (who possesses the most intolerant bigoted spirit that burdens any church in the lower country of my acquaintance,) did nearly, in substance, preach such a sermon from these words:—"Thou art an austere man." This preacher is my next door neighbor. But sir, brother Campbell can inform you I never wrote him one sentence upon that subject in my life, or opened to him my lips about it. It is remarkable that two, if not three, preachers took offence at the publication of this sermon. They had severally preached it almost verbatim.

As respects the church that had not sober members enough to turn out the drunkards, I never heard of such a thing until I saw it in the Christian Baptist.*

As to the chickens, and rehearsing experiences, I did mention to brother Campbell in your presence, as well as I recollect, when I had the pleasure of both of your companies in my house. If you call matters of fact a tale of mine, I am prepared to prove them, in substance, to be correct, by such evidence as will leave no doubt on your mind of their truth. But, brother Semple, why complain about this, when you well know that *Baptist* churches have often turned off colored people under the impression that they have learned what *you call* an experience?

You remark upon my rejoicing at my son's constitutionally entering the kingdom of God's dear Son, that it was a cause of joy, "if I really believe he was *well prepared* for baptism." You say you "feel bound to rejoice with me." If this be so, how comes it to pass, when I informed you of his being baptized upon a profession of faith in Jesus Christ, you replied you would not baptize your son as brother Campbell had done mine—no not for the world? Brother Semple there is an expression used by you, "*well prepared for baptism*," which is the life and soul of baptist principles, I must say to you, as I have said to others, *I fear* that this error of requiring what is erroneously called a *christian experience*, in order to a right to immersion, is the cause of the damnation of thousands, if not millions. I conceive it to be taking away the key of knowledge, and shutting up the kingdom of God against men. To call the mental exercises of any a christian experience, who has never been born of water and the Spirit, is "old wives' fables," or german cousins. Can a man be said to be a christian that has never entered the kingdom of Christ? Can a man have entered the kingdom of God, that has never been born of God; that is, of water and the Spirit? Do the Apostles teach us that any one has put on Christ, that has never been immersed into Christ? And can one have a christian's experience who is not a christian? Is not such language, calling men christians who never were born of water and the Spirit, calculated to gender strife, divisions, schisms, sects, and turmoil? This is a radical error. Do, brother Semple, define what the Apostles required in order to the immersion of their hearers and inquirers to be "well prepared for immersion," and what they call a christian?

I complain of your having led the readers of the Harbinger to believe that I have gloried over the "misfortunes, or afflictions, or faults of my fellow laborers, whose sons have not been immersed." I here must requst the readers of the Harbinger to look into the vii. vol. p. 262, of the Christian Baptist, and read my letter, and then say whether or not I did say, "*many a good man* had cause to weep

*Since writing this letter, a Baptist brother, a deacon, informs me you said to him, that brother Campbell drew this conclusion from your conversation with him, when he first visited this neighborhood. So we go—accuse others of what we say ourselves.

and lament the truth" of what I have said. I stated matters of fact, and if brother Semple disputes this point, calls for the evidence, and will screen me from the persecuting spirit of the present order of things, I will specify cases that will satisfy every rational being of the truth of what I have stated; but not without, as I have no wish to wound the feelings of any one. But, brother Semple, why not assign this unpleasant state of things to the cause I have done, instead of such a gratuitous construction? Did I not give you my reasons for this unhappy state among the sons of preachers? Was it not said to be owing to the manner in which the gospel was taught the human family, of textuary preachers, and sermonizing from a scrap of revelation, and sometimes a word? If you acknowledge this to be a fault, and are ashamed of the wresting, dissecting, and mangling the Word of Life, by my fellow laborers, to sustain them in their opposition to the ancient Apostolic gospel—my excuse is my ignorance of your being convinced of this shameful practice. Had I known better I should not have written thus.

What do you mean by your "sons not having obtained the grace of God"? Am I to understand you, that God must give them more than what they already have, before they can *examine, receive,* and *obey* what he has given them? If this is your meaning, my dear sir, I am not at all surprized that they are unbelievers, and will do nothing in order to obtain God's grace.

You speak of the exemplary lives of some preachers' sons. I cheerfully admit, brother Semple, you and two or three others have sons whose conduct in life is praiseworthy; but you will not deny there are some whose sons do produce what I have stated. I say these things not as glorying over my brethren, but with a sorrowful heart. Let me bring the cause of all this home to you:—you say "we cannot consent to baptize them, until they tell us "*who hath warned them to flee from the wrath to come.*" Is it possible, brother Semple, that you have not at this late day, taught your sons that Jesus Christ and his Apostles "have warned them to flee from the wrath to come," and does not such language prove that I have described the cause of the sons of Baptist preachers living exposed to wrath? In what way have I vaunted myself over my brethren, except that of my son being favored with the proclamation of the ancient Apostolic gospel, and yielding obedience to its requirements?

But the most serious thing is, you charge me with not *stating facts.* In this you have put the rod into my hand to stripe you. But, knowing the Holy Spirit teaches me not to "severely rebuke an old man, but to entreat him as a father"—I will, therefore, attend to my instructer, and only call your attention to what I have said, and the real state of the case. I said that my son was the only one, except two, I *knew of Baptist preachers now living.* Now I call upon you to name more than another within the bounds of the Dover Association of fifty churches. This will determine the truth of my assertion or not, without another word. I did not allude to the sons of any dead; but those specified. How could you know this was not the fact without

knowing the *extent* of *my knowledge* of *the sons* of Baptist preachers dead or living; I say, you cannot point out a Baptist preacher, *now living within the bounds of the Dover Association, that has a son, I am acquainted with*, a professor of religion, but those I have alluded to. I acknowledge there are several sons of preachers that have, since the death of their fathers, bowed their necks to Jesus Christ. Why did I name preachers living? It was to show that their *unreasonable opposition to the ancient gospel, which had made the difference between my son and theirs*, and not the opposition of dead men, who possibly, if they were living, never would have indulged the bigoted, intolerant proscribing spirit of some. You well know that something like papal bulls, and discountenancing societies, (which you informed me was done to force me back into the ranks of the present order of things,) have no influence on me, in deterring me from speaking what I believe, teaching what I am assured of, and censuring what is amiss in the views and conduct of my brethren, than the anathemas of his Holiness in Rome, or the pop-guns of children. I once was a slave to a sectarian priesthood; but now know the sweets of gospel liberty, glory in it by living, not upon the dogmas of a sect, but divine truth alone, which is like a well of water springing up unto everlasting life.

You charge me with raking up the ashes of the dead. I ask you if I did not say that this character, alluded to, was "*one of the best men I ever knew?*" If speaking of errors in doctrine be reproaching and raking up their ashes, think of what you have said of Jeremiah Walker, John Waller, and others. But, brother Semple, why do you claim the liberty of thinking, judging, and speaking your religious sentiments, and not allow the same privilege to others? Is not this assuming the character of a spiritual lord? Mark, I do not say you are one. "Stand by thyself; come not near me; I am more wise and holy than thou." When you advise churches to refuse to hear, to unite in partaking of the loaf and cup, to close their doors against your reforming brethren, (as they would against an Episcopalian, Methodist, or Presbyterian) whose characters are unimpeachable, and for no other cause than their *renouncing the traditions of the elders*, are strong in the faith of the gospel, and some whose talents are superior to yours; I say, when you do these things, you produce a faction, the turmoil that now exists among brethren, and practically declare to the world, *there is no liberty, right, or privilege to be enjoyed any where, but in the kingdom of darkness.* This is proving, without a witness, what the Saviour promised his disciples:—"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." This freedom none can enjoy in the Baptist sect, or any other, but from the hand of those who hold the reins, and give the whip and spur to whomsoever they will. Do you not see this throughout the Baptist churches? What political printer would give place in his columns to charges against a man of character, and then refuse the liberty to the accused to refute the slander, falsehood, or charges? Would not this be a base unrighteous cause, calculated to corrupt the morals

of society, and destroy the reputations of men? Would you not condemn such conduct? My dear sir, then drop your opposition against the disciples of Jesus Christ, and turn your attention to the correcting the abominable conduct of Wm. T. Brantly, Abner. W. Clopton, and Co. If you have any regard for the cause of God, come out from such antichristian conduct, and aid us in correcting the evils among the professors of religion. I have no doubt of your sincerity; but I have every evidence that a rational being needs, in saying, there is a departure from the Apostolic order of things, as handed down to us in the New Testament, by every sect in christendom. I can prove it from their own writings and doings. I have spoken my mind freely to you—it is because I love you; but the truth of God more. I assure you there is not one hostile feeling in my breast against you, either as a man, or a christian, except the foregoing errors. I remain yours in the kingdom and patience of Jesus.

T. M HENLEY.

## PREDICTIONS AND OPINIONS OF EZRA STYLES D. D.

*President of Yale College—commented on by* ISAAC BACKUS, *volume* 3, *page* 10.

AND to prepare the way for a new system of laws, the president of their university said to their legislature, "Dominion is founded in property; and resides where that is, whether in the hands of the few or many." And he held that the power of religious ministers is derived by an external succession from the apostles, through the churches of Rome and England; and said of New-England, "The induction of the ministers of the first churches was performed by lay brethren, and this was called ordination, but should be considered what in reality it was, only induction or instalment of those who were vested with official power. These were all ordained before by the bishops in England." And he encouraged them to go on in supporting such ministers by force, by saying, "God be thanked, the senatorial *Assembly* of this happiest of all the United States, still embosoms so many Phinehases and Zerubbabels, so many religious patriots, the friends of Jesus and his holy religion: And that the Messiah's cause is here accompanied with *civil government* and *priesthood;* allusively the *two olive trees upon the right of the candlestick* (the churches) *and upon the left; the two golden branches, which through the two golden pipes,* Moses and Aaron, *empty the golden oil out of themselves,* and diffuse their salutary influence of order and happiness through the community. Zech. iv. 11. As to nominal Christianity, I have no doubt but that it will be upheld for ages in these States. Through the liberty enjoyed here, all religious sects will grow up into large and respectable bodies. But the Congregational and Presbyterian denominations, however hitherto despised, will, by the blessing of Heaven, continue to hold the greatest figure in America, and, notwithstanding all the fruitless labors and exertions to proselyte us to other communions, become more numerous than the whole collective body of our fellow-protestants in Europe. The

whole proselytism of New England in particular for sixty or seventy years past, has not exceeded eight or ten thousand, while our augment in that term, by *natural increase*, has been half a million."

These things were published by the highest authority in Connecticut, just after the news of peace arrived, and many were pleased therewith. But we would now desire to ask a few questions. And first, as it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than it is for any who *trust in riches* to enter into the kingdom of God, how can dominion be founded in property? Mark x. 24, 25. Yea, as all our American governments are founded in covenants, and not in riches, how dangerous is the above teaching? And as our rulers have solemnly sworn to renounce all foreign jurisdiction over us, how can they compel any to support teachers who hold their power of office by succession from Europe? And as persons who are *born again*, are the only *holy priesthood* that God hath under heaven, how can the priesthood be conveyed by an external laying on of hands? 1 Peter i. 23. ii. 5, 9. And as the *golden oil* is the *Spirit* and *grace* of God, how can it be diffused through a community by the laws of men enforced by the sword? Zech. iv. 6—12. For our Lord warns us to beware of the *leaven of hypocrisy*, which is caused by *covetousness;* to avoid which he refused to be concerned in dividing of estates. Luke xii. 1—15. Neither could Peter give any countenance to the distinction between Jews by *nature*, and sinners of the Gentiles, without *dissimulation*; and *a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*. Gal. ii. 12—15. v. 9. The covenant of circumcision made *natural birth* the first door into the church of Israel; and how can *natural increase* make any better churches now, than it did of the seed of Abraham, who were a *generation of vipers*, and had no right to baptism without personal repentance?

## ROUSSEAU'S OPINION OF THE BIBLE.

THIS divine book, the only one which is indispensable to the Christian, needs only be read with reflection to inspire love for its author, and the most ardent desire to obey its precepts. Never did virtue speak so sweet a language; never was the most profound wisdom expressed with so much energy and simplicity. No one can arise from its perusal without feeling himself better than he was before.

The majesty of the scriptures strikes me with astonishment, and the sanctity of the gospel addresses itself to my heart. Look at the volumes of philosophers, with all their pomp: how contemptible do they appear in comparison to this! Is it possible that a book, at once so simple and sublime, can be the work of man? Can he who is the subject of its history, be himself a mere man? Was his the tone of an enthusaist, or of an ambitious sectary? What sweetness! What purity in his manners! What an affecting gracefulness in his maxims! What profound wisdom in his discourses! What presence of mind, what sagacity and propriety in his answers! How great the command of his passions! Where is the man, where the philo-

sopher, who could so live, suffer and die, without weakness and without ostentation! When Plato described his imaginary good man covered with all the disgrace of crime, yet worthy of all the rewards of virtue, he described exactly the character of Jesus Christ. The resemblance was so striking, it could not be mistaken, and all the fathers of the church perceived it. What prepossession, what blindness must it be, to compare the son of Sophroniscus to the Son of Mary! What an immeasureable distance between them! Socrates, dying without pain, and without ignominy, easily supported his character to the last; and if his death, however, crowned his life, it might have been doubted whether Socrates, with all his wisdom, was any thing more than a mere sophist. He invented, it is said, the theory of moral science. Others, however, had before him put it in practice; and he had nothing to do but to tell what they had done, and to reduce their examples to precept. Aristides had been just, before Socrates had defined what justice was; Leonidas had died for his country, before Socrates had made it a duty to love one's country. Sparta had been temperate, before Socrates had eulogised sobriety; and before he celebrated the praises of virtue, Greece had abounded with virtuous men. But from whom of all his countrymen could Jesus have derived that sublime and pure morality, of which he only has given us both the precept and example? In the midst of the most licentious fanaticism, the voice of the sublimest wisdom was heard, and the simplicity of the most heroic virtue crowned one of the humblest of all the multitude.

The death of Socrates, peaceably philosophising with his friends, is the most pleasant that could be desired! That of Jesus, expiring in torments, outraged, reviled, and execrated by a whole nation, is the most horrible that could be feared. Socrates, in receiving the cup of poison, blessed the weeping executioner who presented it; but Jesus, in the midst of excruciating torture, prayed for his merciless tormentors. Yes! if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God. Shall we say that the evangelical history is a mere fiction? It does not bear the stamp of fiction; but the contrary. The history of Socrates, which no body doubts, is not so well attested as that of Jesus Christ. Such an assertion, in fact, only shifts the difficulty, without removing it. It is more inconceivable that a number of persons should have agreed to fabricate this book, than that one only should have furnished the subject of it.

The Jewish authors are incapable of the diction, and strangers to the morality contained in the gospel, the marks of whose truths are so striking, so perfectly inimitable, that the inventor would be a more astonishing man than the hero.

## REGENERATION—BAPTISM.

*Testimony of* Rev. Pliny Fisk, *late Missionary to Palestine.*

WHILE on the ground, or near to the place, where, in the Apostle John's time, existed one of the congregations of our Lord Jesus Christ;—viz. at *Smyrna.* Mr. Fisk wrote;—

"I also visited the Greek priests frequently, for the purpose of reading the scriptures with them. After reading our Saviour's discourse to Nicodemus, I asked, "What is regeneration?" The head priest replied, 'Baptism.' I asked, 'Is it water baptism merely, or does it imply also the regeneration of the heart by the Holy Spirit?' 'It certainly implies the latter,' he said. I replied, Suppose a man has been baptized, but his heart remains unholy, and he has no true faith—can he be saved? 'Certainly not,' was the reply. I then entered into conversation to show the nature and necessity of the renewing influences of the Holy Spirit. To all which he said he readily assented."

THE ACTION —IMMERSION—[*Memoir*, p. 161, 162.]

"From Arissa we went in half an hour to Sharfi, a convent of Syrian Catholics. I learn from the bishops that they baptized thus:—The child is placed in the font so that a part of the body is in the water; then the officiating priest three times takes water in his hands and pours it on the child's head repeating at each time the name of one person of the Trinity. After this the body is immersed; but when I inquired whether the immersion was an essential part of baptism, they said, "No—the baptism would be valid and perfect without it." *Ib.* p. 325, 326.

Transcribed and forwarded for the Millennial Harbinger by
FRANCIS.

---

*MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

J Stewart, Malloys, Ten. paid vol. 1 for himself. S Ring, Ring's Mill, Ohio, vol. 1 for himself. E Nichols, Readyville, Ten. vol. 1 for himself, J Ramsey, J Wright, T B Springs, and J Youree. F Thompson, Mont Alban, Miss. vol. 1 for J Huilam, J Newman, J E Davis, W J Longacre, and S T Lane. J Gist, Va. vol. 1 for himself. J Jenkins, Pa. vol. 1 for himself. D Kellough, Bloomington, Ia. vol. 1 for Nichols & Hall; B Davis, Ebensburg, Pa. vol. 1; J Lydick, F Tibbott, and J Davis; also, 1 dollar for E Davis. M Winans, Jamestown, Ohio, paid 3 dollars. J M'Allister, Williamsport, Pa. vol. 1 for himself and A L Lloyd. P L Townes, Painville, Va. vol. 1 for J B Hunt, W Blanton, W Morshem, J C Foster, T Roulette, J Wood, A Lay, F Lawson, T S Horner, and H Anderson. Mr. Martin, West Liberty, Va. vol. 1 himself. T Thompson, Columbia, Mo. vol. 1 for R S Barr, D S Lamb, J H Burnett, J B Gordon, A J Williams, J Stemmons, T Hart, O Parker, M Baker, G Tuttle, W Phillips, and R Cave, Sen. J T Jones, Cincinnati, vol. 1 for D Corwin, J P Vanhawter, J Challin, J Watkins, and M S Robinson. J R Evans, Athens, Ala. vol. 1 for H Golightly and J Crowder; also, one dollar for G Tucker. J C Ingram, Wylesburg, Va. vol. 1 for J B Ingram, P Powell, H Turpine, T Murden, and G J Roberts. W C Ralls, Rushville, Illinois, vol. 1 for B Chadsey and J B Teas; also, 1 dollar for himself. E Sweat, Lebanon, Ten. vol. 1 for J Shaver. T Hunt, Madisonville, Ten. vol 1 for himself. R Howard, Florence, Ohio, vol. 1 for himself. M R Trimble, Sangamo, Illinois, vol. 1 for M Elder, R Radford, J Langston, J Morgan, and E Jones. O Little, Charlestown, Ia. vol. 1 for himself, D Gray, D Drummond, J White, J Morris, and Fowler & Dow. T B Power, Yorktown, Va. vol. 1 for R C Coke, of Williamsburg, and K P Elliot, Yorktown. Dr. Wright, Windham, Ohio, paid vol. 1 for J Rudolph, Jun. and vol. 1 for S Rider; also, 2 dollars for another person, whose name is not given.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 12. | BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1830. | Vol. 1.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## LETTERS TO HUMPHREY MARSHAL, Esq.

### *LETTER II.*

SIR—

NO two writers, as far as I have read, attack the christian religion in the same manner, nor upon the same principles. The Sceptics are very far from being agreed among themselves as to the test to which it ought to be subjected, or as respects the tribunal before which its pretensions ought to be tried. It is true they all talk about its being "submitted to the test of reason," and some add, "to the test of experience." But the gentlemen of your fraternity are as much at odds on the subject of reason, as on the subject of religion. With some it is reasonable to try christianity as they try a theorem in mathematics; with others, it is reasonable to examine its evidences as though it were a question of metaphysics; a third class say it is reasonable to decide upon its pretensions on the principles of individual experience; and a fourth will have it tried as a criminal in a court of law; and I may add, there are not a few who deem it most reasonable that it should be tried before all these tribunals in one general confederation. So long, then, as your brotherhood of philosophers are so variant on what reason decides, as to the court of inquiry before which christianity is to be examined, it is not strange that among Sceptics there should be so many sects, so many modes of attack, and so general an ignorance of what christianity is.

We may differ as much about reason as religion, and about the manner of conducting the trial as about the thing to be tried. For my part, I must confess that I esteem it unreasonable in the highest degree to submit the pretensions of the Scriptures to the same tribunal before which I might submit a poem, a fine painting, a piece of architecture, a question in algebra, in physics, or in metaphysics. Neither could I agree to have it tried in a court of common law, nor in a court of chancery, by such rules as litigated questions of law and equity are decided. If, however, any question of fact, one or two thousand years since asserted, can be decided before such canons, I object not to join issue with you on the premises, that by all the same rules, canons, and regulations which you can bring to bear upon any question of fact

on record, will I have the question of the resurrection tried. In whatever court, before whatever judges, by whatever laws of trial you would ascertain the truth or falsehood of Cromwell's protectorate, of the Saxon conquests, of the ascension of the Cesars to imperial power, the victories of Hannibal, the birth, life, and death of Cyrus, Alexander, Alfred, or Queen Elizabeth—in the same court, before the same judges, and by the same laws will the resurrection of Jesus be proved.

This *I* call reason. *You* may call it what you please. All mathematical questions I submit to the canons of Euclid—all questions in natural philosophy, to experiment and analogy—all questions of common law, to courts of law: but questions of fact, historical fact, to that tribunal before which all historical facts are decided. The error on which your objections proceed is, that you will try historical facts in the same court and before the same laws by which you would try a question of fact, the witnesses to which are all living. You cannot elude the reasonableness of the distinction which I here lay down, by telling me that all questions of fact are questions respecting the past, and, consequently, so far *historical*, and therefore all belong to one and the same chapter: for the most common mind will at once perceive that no person would think of proving the truth of Cataline's conspiracy as was tried that of Aaron Burr. No person would have thought of proving the assassination of Col. Sharp, as he would prove the assassination of Julius Cesar. The evidence necessary to convict a thief or a murderer in our courts of law, differs essentially from that which is necessary to prove that Columbus was the first discoverer of America, or that Cicero wrote his Orations.

Some of our laughing Sceptics, of the most fashionable schools, with an air of superior wisdom, inform us deluded christians that we could not recover a shilling in any court of law upon such testimony as we have to offer for our confidence in God and our faith in Jesus. This is one of Miss Frances Wright's finest thoughts—one of her most puissant blows at the christian faith. Some of the Deists, too, in the neighborhood of Frankfort, Ky. likewise triumph in their own estimation by the same argument. No man, say they, could prove any fact in court upon such testimony as we have to offer for the resurrection of Jesus. This may all be true, and yet the gospel true. I would ask them but one question here: Could a person recover a shilling in any court of law or equity upon such testimony as he has to offer for any historic fact which happened from the Creation to the Year of Grace 1700? Could you, sir, recover a shilling in any court in the United States by such testimony as you have to offer for your belief in the existence of such persons as Newton, Boyle, Bacon, Locke, Columbus, or any other person or event of whose existence you are assured? If, then, you could not, why discredit the resurrection of Jesus by objections drawn from such reasonings—by conclusions from such premises! This boast of other Sceptics, for which you manifest so strong an inclination, is just as pertinent to the points at issue, as though one should say, 'All the arguments or evidences you have to offer for your belief in the resurrection would not prove

that a triangle has three sides and three angles, or that things that are equal to the same are equal to one another!"

But, sir, if there be any historic fact which happened before the christian era, cotemporaneous with it, or during sixteen hundred years since, which you believe, name it; and I will undertake to show that you have better reasons to believe the fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead than that fact, whatever it may be. The only question here is, Can we act with certainty upon any testimony, or is testimony of any character capable of giving us assurance? If you say *No*, then you ought not to object to the testimony because of its character, because all testimony would then be inadequate. If you say *Yes*, then it behoves you to show that the apostolic testimony, with all its concomitants, is inferior to that testimony which you have to offer for other historic facts of which you are assured. But this we presume to assert you cannot do.

Persons may reject the christian religion on the ground that it is the subject of history—that it comes to us through human testimony —that it is based on facts, which facts are necessarily to us matters of belief. In one word, they may reject christianity because it is first of all a matter of faith—because they suppose it incompatible with their views of Divinity that the salvation of men should be made dependant on that which does not always produce absolute certainty. They argue that it is unsafe, and consequently unworthy of the Author of the Universe, to make salvation directly or indirectly dependant on belief. When a Sceptic candidly avows this to be the ground of his objection to the christian religion, we know how to address him. We are prepared to show that this power we have of proving testimony to be true, or what is the same thing, this power which we have of believing testimony, is the most simple, natural, powerful, and universal principle of action belonging to the human constitution, and that there is not in human nature a principle of action so suitable, so well adapted to become the basis of religion as this principle of faith. We are prepared to show, if we have not already showed, that it is impossible in the nature of things, as far as known to mortal man, that it could have been based upon any other principle. Good testimony, or testimony corresponding with the nature of the facts attested, is capable of producing all that certainty of assurance necessary to make man pure and happy: and that is enough, our enemies themselves being judges. If the facts to be believed are supernatural facts, the testimony is supernatural also, and supported by all that nature and reason can contribute to sustain any testimony.

But I have not found in your pamphlet that you make such an avowal. You, sir, object not to religion because founded upon testimony; but the burthen of your book is to prove that the testimony is incompetent, contradictory, or some way incredible.

As you have chosen your own course in objecting, I shall choose mine in replying; and as you single out the article of the resurrection of Jesus, or the testimony on which it is sustained, as, in your

judgment, incompetent, I will first turn my attention to your objections to that testimony. This shall be the burthen of my next letter.

With all due respect,

EDITOR.

## Philalethes on the Scriptures.

[*Continued from page* 402.]

IT moreover tends to prevent that patient, persevering consultation of the Spirit's words which is absolutely necessary, and other subordinate helps which the Spirit has provided for enabling an unbiassed, unfettered, diligent, and attentive reader of his message to understand it. Indeed, when a person has once admitted that the meaning given to a word or passage by an interpreter of any sort, is the meaning intended by the Spirit, he has as completely fettered the efforts of his own mind to ascertain its meaning as if he had secured them in a vice, and forever after continues to be a believer, not of what the Spirit tells him, but of what his interpreter has told him. And shall I be forgiven if here I notice an inconsistency that appears in the conduct of every interpreter of God's word. Every one of them takes the liberty of bursting the fetters and throwing off the shackles with which his predecessors or contemporaries had attempted to bind him fast; and no sooner has he asserted his liberty and indulged his propensity to inquire for himself, than he proceeds to forge new chains for all around him, and all that come after him.

20. This human contrivance offers to that God who has himself condescended to become our instructer, the grossest insult. For what greater insult can we offer to our Maker, than to prefer an instrument of instruction of our own devising, to one prepared and sent us by him, or to employ the former in the place of the latter? For my part, I can conceive none.

21. This human invention treats God's message precisely as Sir Walter Scott has treated the civil history of his country. Mr. Scott has made that history the mere occasion, or rather material, for constructing an endless number of fabulous and amusing stories, and the intermeddlers with God's word have engrafted on it an endless number of religious tales as remote from the truth of Scripture, as Scott's novels are from the truth of history. What multitudes of these fabulous productions are discharged from the pulpit every Lord's day, and from the press every day!

22. To the many distinctions already noticed between the instrument of religious information furnished by God, and that fabricated by men, I add one more. Sacred writ, the instrument furnished by God, is made up entirely of facts and precepts. The facts which it declares to its reader are very numerous, and of the greatest utility; and to evince their reality it furnishes the highest possible evidence, the unerring knowledge, and immaculate veracity of a God. But though it reveals innumerable facts to man, which man, without such revelation, could never have with certainty discovered; yet it never

explains, nor ever attempts or professes to explain the manner of their accomplishment, nor to assign the causes which produced them; nay, it commonly specifies but few of the concomitant circumstances, and generally takes no notice of either the place or the time of their occurrence, nor of the object which they are intended to effect: thus treating man with respect to intellectual, spiritual, and invisible things, precisely in the same manner as he is treated with respect to his corporeal and temporal concerns during his residence on earth. In the present life as such facts are placed within man's observation as are necessary and sufficient to enable him to provide for his animal happiness, while the causes which produce them and the manner of their coming into existence, bid complete defiance to human sagacity; so such facts are declared to him in sacred writ, accompanied with all the assurance of their reality that the unerring knowledge and spotless veracity of God can create, as are necessary and sufficient, and if duly improved, to secure to him an intellectual or spiritual felicity, intense above conception, and lasting as the immortal mind. Nor is the reason of difficult discovery why so many deeply interesting and edifying facts, natural and revealed, are furnished, and no explanations attached to them, nor attainable of them. The reason manifestly is, that it was absolutely necessary for us to know the facts in order to our being put in a condition to provide for our temporal and eternal happiness, but not the explanations. Nay, had explanations been given, or rendered possible, they would not only have been unprofitable, but highly detrimental. They would have no doubt served the purpose of pampering a useless curiosity; but they would have afforded no profitable information: nay, they would have wasted much time and necessarily diverted the creature's attention from the facts that were eminently conducive, or rather indispensable to his well-being.

As to the precepts contained in sacred writ, their immense utility and absolute necessity are so certified to us by the unerring knowledge and boundless kindness of our invisible Parent who enjoined them, as to admit of no additional proof from the tongue or pen of man.

The very reverse of sacred writ in this respect is the instrument of religious instruction fabricated and offered by the clergy. It consists almost entirely of vain, presumptuous, and abortive attempts to explain facts, for the explanation of which God has given no capacity to man, of fanciful and imaginary circumstances, which they have dared to add to God's information, of vain labor to ascertain places and other objects, and to fix the dates and other circumstances of facts, for the ascertainment of which God has furnished us with no means to assign ends and purposes of which we literally know nothing, and, which is worse still, to make the divine precepts enjoin just what they fancy. Remove from man's instrument of religious instruction all such contemptible and unprofitable trash, and the residue would scarcely be visible.

Now, reader, I have endeavored with truth, fairness, and simplicity, to set before you, the origin, nature, tendency, and effects of the

two instruments of religious instruction that have long been in use among christians. It is your part to compare diligently, reflect maturely, and prefer that one which really merits your preference; for a choice is before you. You may either make use of God's instrument of instruction, or that which your fellow-creatures, fallible, blundering, uninspired mortals have provided, for you. To use both is to involve yourselves in an inextricable labyrinth of absurdities, as well as to offer gross insult to your Maker. For my own part my choice has long been made. For many years I have consulted on the subject of religion no book but the Bible; and it is my firm belief that were the Bible diligently, attentively, and reverentially read as a message fresh from God, and as the only book which we either need, or can, according to God's will, use for the salvation of our souls; and were all who can read the Bible urged by every proper consideration to read it; and to those who cannot read it themselves, were it to be read in a solemn and impressive manner by every professed friend of the Redeemer, on every proper occasion; and were the professed friends of the Saviour to take care to observe truth in all they speak, punctuality in all they engage to do, justice in all their dealings, humanity in all their actions, and temperance, purity, and self-government in all their deportment—it is, I say, my firm belief, that were these things duly attended to, that Christ's cause would assuredly and speedily triumph over all opposition, were all the clergymen now in being to disappear in the twinkling of an eye, and every page written on the subject of religion, the Bible excepted, sent up to heaven in one conflagration. For then the management of Christ's affairs would be placed in the hands of those to whose fidelity he has entrusted them, and his conquest of the world confided to the use of that powerful instrument alone which he has provided and prepared for the purpose.

But I terminate this long discussion with a repetition of the assertion which I have made over and over again, that to employ, for the purpose of acquiring religious knowledge, any modification of God's information, other than that in which he has judged it best to communicate his mind to us, is gross impiety and insult. On the one hand it is a flat denial of God's ability to instruct us, and a daring ascription of imperfection to his attempt, and on the other, an arrogant assumption of capacity on our part to ameliorate God's work, and purge it of all defects. PHILALETHES.

## To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

I HAVE just returned from the Dover Association, where I went as a spectator and an inquirer. Such was the pleasing information I received, that I had determined to communicate it to you before I saw the 9th number of the Harbinger. Your labor is not in vain in the Lord. Light is evidently dawning. We counted *ten public teachers* who are more or less advocates for the ancient gospel, not one of them whose talents are not far before mine, and some equal, if not superior to any in the Association. All of these teachers live within the bounds

of the Dover Association. It has been my object, and I am pleased to hear it is theirs also, to prevent, if possible, a splitting up the churches into sects. Such is our abhorrence of sectarianism, that we would suffer much before we would break off from them. Nothing but their refusing us the liberty of partaking of the loaf, and the use of their houses, will induce us to separate from them. I fear this will be the case, if I am to judge from the language of Bishop Semple and a few of "his followers." He says he can commune with us as men, but not with our principles. This is the poorest "come-off" I ever heard. I should be glad to know why he places so much value upon a man without principles, and so little upon our being possessed of principles as to be unworthy of his fellowship. We do hereby invite Bishop Semple *to prove from the New Testament*, (not his say-so, or his church resolutions, as his Holiness of Rome does,) any one principle we hold is erroneous, much less corrupt.*

It is impossible for me to communicate at this time *the great number of friends in this Association to the ancient gospel.* I have been credibly informed that three of the churches in King William county are almost unanimous. No discord, no division, nor contention among them. These truly intelligent and pious people are decided friends of reformation. Those brethren that do not read your writings, consequently do not understand your views, are men of intelligence and liberality. They claim the right to form their own judgment of truth, and speak their sentiments, and they are willing that their brethren shall do the same. This is like disciples of Jesus Christ. They are increasing in number in the lower part of the county daily. The churches in the Association where the intolerant spirit reigns are at a stand. They will not enter themselves as advocates for the ancient apostolic doctrine, but the traditions of the elders, and shut up the kingdom of heaven against men.

I am sorry to say, that one of your correspondents who has been defeated, (previous to that, and Bishop Semple's last letter in the 8th number of the Harbinger,) informed me in July last, and others, that he could commune with me, and had no disposition to injure my influence. He stirred up his *old rusty rules* in September, with one or two of his deacons, to get the church he was Pastor of to refuse to commune with me; and to effect this *noble object*, charged me with *moral impropriety*, that is, *a departure from moral rectitude.* One of his deacons charged me with *defamation*, and the other said he had as lief commune with as abandoned a wretch as he could find, as with me. This Pastor heard him say, it was nothing he had against my moral character, but because I held those reforming sentiments, without offering a word of reproof, or rebuke to him!!! When I demanded of the Pastor and his Deacon the evidence upon which their assertions were made, they referred me to a letter I wrote in the Christian Baptist, vol. ii. page 239—40. It was said I there defamed the churches by classing them with murderers and drunkards. How

** Bishop Semple has been challenged to debate the points at issue, every one of them, before his own church, but manfully declined.*

thirsty must that man be to destroy by a church censure him whom he could not confute in argument! Let any reader, or christian, look at the last part of the second paragraph, and the first of the third, and compare with what I said about the 18, and then decide whether it was the churches, or those proscribing scabby sheep among them, called "*sectarian spirits*," which I expressed my happiness at there not "*being more than two such characters in any one congregation I am acquainted with.*" They will have to prove there are *no such characters among them*, before they can be justified in attacking my moral character. Without they do this, they certainly must stand condemned as false accusers. The church did not do any thing with the affair. Possibly I may at some future day give you the names of the parties concerned, but withhold them now, hoping they will see the persecuting spirit they have indulged against me without a cause, and reform. JASON.

## METAPHYSICAL REGENERATION—*No. III.*

IT will be remembered that Mr. Andrew Fuller defines his strict regeneration to be "a real physical work, whereby the Holy Spirit imparts spiritual life to the souls of all who are truly regenerated." It were well for mankind that the terms were well defined which writers use in all these great controversies, on the one side of which all is life; and on the other side of which all is death. To make men damnably erroneous for a tenet, contradictory to "essential points," it is surely necessary and all-important that these essential points should be plainly expressed, in a style familiar and perspicuous to all. In this definition of "strict regeneration" there is great obscurity resting upon the subject for the want of a definition of the terms. It is a philosophical definition and couched in terms excogitated by speculative reasoners; very unlike the terms which the Holy Spirit employs to communicate his mind to men upon the gospel.

A "physical work" few understand; and "spiritual life" is a phrase not understood by a tithe of those who use it. Ask a majority of our proclaimers and teachers what they mean by either, or both of these expressions, and how embarrassed will they be to give an intelligible definition. Mr. Fuller gives a hint or two indicative of his meaning of "physical power." He means a power in which there is nothing moral; that is, in which there are no motives presented. As for example, no motives were presented to man in order to make him *rational:* he was made rational without argument, or persuasion; just as he was made with two eyes or two feet. The power that made man *rational* was the same which made a fish swim, a bird fly, or a stone quiescent; and was put forth in the same manner. No moral power, or power influencing by motive, was displayed in giving either fins and scales, or their use, to fishes; or wings and their use to birds. Fire acts physically upon metals; and a hammer in the hand of the smith who uses it, works physically upon the iron. But he that overcomes by persuasion, argument, or motive, works *morally*, as philosophers would call it; and such power as operates upon the under

standing, will, or affections of men to induce to voluntary action, is called *moral power.*

He who seizes a man, and manacles his hands or fetters his feet by superior strength, overcomes physically; but he who persuades a man to submit to reason, or to yield by motive or persuasion, overcomes morally. Now when God works physically upon men's minds according to this dogma of the Rabbis, he pays no more regard to the reason, will, or affections, than Samson did to the fingers and toes of the Philistines whom he vanquished in battle. Such is the "*physical power*" of the schools.

"*Spiritual life*" is a phrase of more subtilty than the phrase "physical power." The meaning of the latter is much more easily approached than the import of the former. Indeed, philosophers themselves are puzzled to define *life* of any sort. Before we inquire into this *spiritual life* of the schools, we shall make an effort to illustrate *life* simply, and relatively considered.

To do this in the most familiar and intelligible style, we shall begin with the lowest species of life. And first of *vegetable* life:—That vegetables live and die is as universally admitted as that animals live and die. Hence "*a dead tree*" is as common a phrase as "*a dead man.*" There is then a change from one state to another in vegetables, as well as in animals, which change is a passing from life to death. There are all the incipient and progressive stages of vegetable, as of animal life. To trace these is not our object; but to inquire, *In what does the life of a vegetable consist?* It consists not in the power of locomotion, or of changing its place; this is not necessary to its life; but it consists in a power of abstracting from the material system such elements as are homogeneous with itself, or correspondent to its nature, by means of which it continues to increase in stature, and to produce seeds, which, when returned to the earth, will have the same power of abstracting the same properties from the material system, and of exhibiting the same attributes to the senses of man. Vegetable life, then, consists in this connexion, or in this power of abstracting from the material system certain qualities conducive to its continued connexion with the system.

Let this connexion with the earth and atmosphere be destroyed, or let this power of abstracting by its roots, bark, and leaves, from the earth and atmosphere its appropriate food or sustenance, and a change appears which we call death. The death of a vegetable is its separation from the earth and atmosphere, or its losing the power of abstracting from both its necessary sustenance. This may be done by injuring its roots, its bark, or its leaves. These are its vital organs, or the means through which the power of abstracting is exhibited.—Whenever this power begins to fail, its verdure diminishes, its decay commences, it sickens and dies. When fully dead it has no power of abstracting any thing from the material system: nay, it gives itself back to its parents, and is reduced to its elementary principles Such are the phenomena of vegetable life and death.

Animal life is the second rank or grade of existence with which we

are acquainted. This also it will appear consists in a similar connexion with the material system, or in a power of abstracting by certain organs from the material system, elementary principles, or such aliments or properties of matter as are capable of being converted into its own nature, or incorporated with itself. By means of these abstractions from the earth and atmosphere its existence is continued, or these powers are augmented, until it arrives at such a period or stage of life as weakens these powers of abstraction, when it either suddenly expires or gradually sickens and dies. Death is a deprivation of these powers, or a separation from the material systems, by some change in the organization of the animal.

The organization of both plants and animals differ not only in the genera, but in the species; and as no two species of plants are organized exactly in the same manner, so they do not abstract precisely the the same properties from the material system. This is equally true of all the species of animals. But notwithstanding all differences in organization, and in the qualities abstracted, still the power of abstracting, or that which constitutes life, is the same in all. The dissolution of this connexion with the material system is that which constitutes *death*, or it is that which we understand by this term.

This is all we know of life and death from observation and reason. Beyond vegetable and animal life we have no knowledge except from revelation and analogy. But, aided by these means, we ascend higher in the developement, as well as in the enjoyment of life. Man is now capable, as experience proves, of standing in connexion with *two* systems; and that he once did so stand in connexion with two systems, (the *material* and the *spiritual*,) revelation abundantly testifies. God is a spirit, and he is himself the spiritual system. Connexion with him, or a power of deriving from him those qualities and blessings conducive to intellectual and moral health, is that which constitutes what may be called *spiritual* or rational life.

We know of but two systems—*Matter* and *Mind*. Man is the key-stone of the great arch of life which connects both systems. In him both systems meet:—

> "The flesh to worms and dust allied;
> "The soul to God and heaven akin."

Animal life, and rational or spiritual life, he is capable of, and did originally enjoy. When he transgressed he was severed as a branch from the vine. He was cut off from the spiritual system. He had no power of deriving aught from it; and although alive to the material, he was dead to the spiritual system. But let it be remembered that life is connexion with, and death separation from, any system, whether material or spiritual. Animal life all men enjoy in common with other animals; and of all the actions thereof, they are still capable: but unless connected with the spiritual systems by some new media, there is no enjoyment of that life.

This idea carried out suggests the necessity of what christianity developes; viz.—that as Adam was the key-stone of the great arch of life between two worlds, now that the key-stone has fallen, it behoves

that some person possessing in himself not only a human body and spirit, but also a relation or connexion with the spiritual system, of such intimacy as to make himself not only "*the way*" of return, but "*the life*" itself, should be exhibited, and be a second Adam to the race of men. Hence Jesus stands forth confessed and proved to be this life of men. "*He that has the Son has this life; and he that has not the Son has not this life.*" This new life, call it *spiritual, rational,* or *eternal* life, is now to be enjoyed only in the Messiah. Our life, say the christians, is hid in Christ. "He is our life." He has formed for us a connexion with the spiritual system; so that no man can now come to the Father, or enjoy this life, but by him.

These things premised, we are in some measure prepared to canvass the dogma of the schoolmen touching the "impartation of spiritual life to the soul by physical power." How heat and moisture can quicken an acorn, or cause it to germinate; how animal heat can quicken an egg; how organized matter, animal or vegetable, may have life called forth, we have some faint idea: but how life is imparted without means, remains yet to be unfolded when the mysteries of the schools are developed. *What is life,* is a question to be decided before this *spiritual life,* physically imparted, can be understood.

But suppose that there is any, the least analogy, between any thing called *life,* animal or vegetable, and this spiritual life, does it not appear that it is by receiving Jesus as "the way, the truth, and *the life,*" and only by being engrafted into him, that we can be made alive to God? If so, this physical quickening is wholly a human invention.

It appears to be more consonant with the christian philosopher, Paul the Apostle, to affirm that the quickening act, or that which imparts spiritual life is the act of remission. This he positively affirms. "You," says he to the Colossians, chapter ii. 13, "who were dead in trespasses and in the uncircumcision of your flesh, has he *made alive,* having forgiven you all trespasses." Sin cut man off from the spiritual system. Our iniquities have separated between us and our God. They have gone up over our heads as a cloud; yea, as a thick cloud, and we see not the light of his animating countenance. "*Dead in trespasses and sins*" is the death of which the Apostle has spoken. Absolve or remove these trespasses and sins, and we can approach God with confidence, and can have communion and fellowship with him. Without this there can be no friendly connexion; so no life. But so soon as we are buried and raised with Jesus, we begin to enjoy this new life; "we are made alive together with him;" and as those alive from the dead, we now walk in a new life—have our fruit to holiness, and the end everlasting life.

Whatever that act be which engrafts us into Christ, that is the act by which the life that is in him is communicated to us. If that act be a physical operation upon the mind, then is spiritual life imparted by such an act; but if, as Paul teaches, we are "planted together with him," or "put him on," by being through faith "immersed into his death," then we are born of God only when "born of water and

the Spirit," and made alive from the dead, when raised with him to a new life. "If, then, you be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sits at the right hand of God; for you are dead (wherein you were once alive) and your life is hid with Christ by God." EDITOR.

*Cambridge, Ohio,* October 28, 1830.

## ABNER W. CLOPTON, GARNER M'CONNICO, &c.

LEST any reader of the *Harbinger* should take it into his head that my having ceased to publish the numbers of *Abner W. Clopton,* is because there is something *argumentative* in them, I will here insert one entire number, that the reader may see with what weapons Mr. Clopton assails the Restoration. His pieces are mere defamation from beginning to end. He has written to his friends to help him to curse bitterly; but has no reason nor argument to offer. He has got some assistance from Tennessee. The old man appears as large as life in Mr. Clopton's coadjutor, the good, old, high-toned, Gillized Calvinist, Mr. *Garner M'Connico;* and it seems they have two allies in that vicinity, Messrs. *Whitsitt* and *Atkinson.* These old men have been going the rounds upon the "*five points*" of John Calvin, until they find them all in every text from Genesis to Jude. I am glad there were many *witnesses* to most of the twelve hours chat alluded to in this letter. Whether the following be a fair report, I vouch not; I leave that to others to decide. But that I ever said the things alleged against me here, I must beg leave to deny in some important points at least. My prefatory remarks to the Epistle to the Ephesians I am glad were written before that day; and I trust no person will think that, with the new version in my hand, I contradicted what I had written in it. I have not so good a memory (probably!) as Mr. M'Connico. He in his 59th year can quote, with great accuracy, a conversation which happened *four years ago*; yes, *verbatim,* he can give the details of twelve hours, or the result of the whole matter. It would be well for this zealous old Calvinist, and his good brothers Whitsitt and Atkinson, if they could remember the words of the Apostles and be as zealous for their testimony as they are for their own honor and the dogmas of the dark ages, which unfortunately they began to preach without understanding them, and must now defend because they have preached them. But we shall give place to these worthy champions of orthodoxy:— ED. M. H.

*From the Columbian Star and Christian Index.*

## MR. CLOPTON'S REVIEW OF CAMPBELLISM—*No. VI.*

Matt. vii. 16. "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"

THE following letter exhibits something more of Mr. Campbell, and of his fruits:—

FRANKLIN, (Ten.) July 22, 1830.

*Elders Clopton and Jeffries,*

I have received from each of you a letter, requesting, in substance, about the same information. And as such, I answer you both jointly,

as it will save time and labor; for I am but a bad scribe at best, and as I grow older, writing becomes more laborious. This I offer as an apology for this method of writing.

When Alexander Campbell came before the public by his debate with Walker, and rendered himself notorious, I saw something in the debate very objectionable (to me at least;) and said to some of the brethren, I was *doubtful* of the Scotchman. His views of John's baptism, and of the commencement of the gospel dispensation, raised my doubts. His debate with M'Calla still heightened my fears. When his prospectus for the Christian Baptist came out I became a subscriber, and read carefully its pages. I thought him an able disputant, but a bad divine; and said to some of the brethren, that Alexander the Great, and Alexander the coppersmith, and Alexander Campbell of Brooke county, were brethren. A member thought my remarks unauthorized. I said time was a good expositor and a revealer of secrets, and that I had no doubt but we should see some new-fangled *religious* infidelity set up in the churches. Out comes a prospectus for (another) a New Testament, which was to be taken from Doctors Macknight, George Campbell, and Doddridge. Well, I took the new book and read it attentively, and what did I see? Behold a New Testament made up of scraps from Doctors C—, M'N—, D—, T—, and G—, and when neither of them suited, he puts his own rendering. And this Testament is handed to the public, well suited to the *religious* infidelity of the Unitarian compiler.

In this New Testament the divinity of Christ, the work of the Spirit, gospel repentance, gospel faith, regeneration by divine grace, and the effectual calling of the sinner, and of the minister of Christ, could not be so well sustained as by the common translation of the Testament. And religion is now made (according to this) a mere human science—and consequently all the standing religious sects are wrong, and a new theory, *falsely* called the Ancient Gospel, is introduced. What a Pope!! When Alexander Campbell was in this country, children (in the gospel) that I had raised—ministers that I had baptized—were elated at the prospect that the strong opposition I had felt and manifested against Campbellism would be prostrated. Accordingly, I was requested to meet him in the town of Franklin. I repaired to the spot. When he came in sight, myself and others were waiting the event. It was the time of court in Franklin, and the house was literally filled with spectators and hearers. Being seated, he was informed that I did not think so favorably of his religious views. Well, said Campbell, brother M'Connico does not understand me. Perhaps not, said I. We then commenced a conversation, and continued for twelve hours with but little intermission. About the time the clock struck nine, I said, Brother Campbell, I profess to be an *honest* man—and, therefore, before I leave you this evening, I must say to you, I have read all you have written, and have now conversed with you twelve hours; and that I do not believe one word of your doctrine, taken as a whole. What doctrine? said he. I have no doctrine but the New Testament. I do not believe, replied I, your views of the New Testament. I have no views, said he, but

that testimony. Come and hear me preach to-morrow, and I hope to satisfy you. I did so. But alas! satisfied! Yes. How? Why, *that he was not a gospel preacher.* He commented on the whole Epistle to the Ephesians in his new book, (Testament.) Myself and others sat behind him in the pulpit. He said, among other things, that that Epistle was addressed to the Gentiles as a nation, and not a christian congregation. I involuntarily read out the address. (Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, to the *saints* which are at Ephesus.) The preachers by my side started as if electrified. Campbell turned and looked at me—smiled—and proceeded to say, *The best thing we could do, would be to forget all we had ever learned, and begin to learn anew.* Yes, said I, and you are to be the teacher. He again looked and smiled. After three hours comment and argument to prove that the doctrine of pre-appointment as held by Calvin and others was not true, and that all their religious theories were false; he closed by pressing on the minds of the hearers the truth and utility of his own—(theory.) After dinner I asked Campbell how he would proceed to build a church, or, as he would call it, a christian congregation. Well, said he, I will suppose I was coming to Nashville to settle permanently. I would commence a series of discourses, in which I would prove that Jesus was the Son of God and the Saviour of sinners, and that the New Testament was the Word of God. And when all my authorities, vouchers, and arguments had been laid before the people, I would then request them to come together; and all who believed (or would say they believed) that Jesus was the Son of God, I would take to the river, immerse them, and pronounce them a christian congregation. Well, said I, nine-tenths of the people of this country could say all you would ask them to say, and therefore you would take them by wholesale. Such, said he, must be the state of things when the ancient order is set up. Such, replied I, was not the course of the apostolic order.

*My beloved brethren*—Campbellism has carried away many whom I thought firm. These wandering stars and clouds without water, ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth, make proselytes much more the children of the devil than they were before. O Lord! hear the cries and see the tears of the Baptists; for Alexander has done them much harm. The Lord reward him according to his works. Look at the Creaths of Kentucky. Look at Anderson, Craig, and Hopwood, of Tennessee. See them dividing churches, and spreading discord, and constituting churches out of excommunicated members. Such shuffling—such lying—such slandering—such evil speaking—such dissembling—such downright hypocrisy—and all under the *false* name of reformation.

Save me from *such* a reform, and *such* reformers. Cumberland Association has excommunicated Anderson, Craig, and their followers. Ah! my brethren, these are some of my ill-begotten children! Some say that I called Craig to preach. Really, it looks like some of my work; for if the Lord had done it, it would have been *well* done. They have made a division in Cool Spring Church. There they claim the church book, and hold (as they say) the constitution,

and yet preach as contrary to the principles on which the church was constituted as any two things can be.

The Association pronounced the old party the church, and excluded Anderson, Craig, and all who had gone off with them. These were a large minority—they say the majority. But it is not so. These two churches are in one house; if that party may be called a church.

At Lepres Fork Church a small party have gone over to Campbellism. Some had been excluded before, either for their principles or conduct. Here they have built up in the same house what they call a church. Of this church old brother Atkinson has the charge, and here is his membership. At Big Harpeth Church, where I have lived and served thirty-two years, ten or twelve members have left us. Of these excluded members they have built in Franklin, with one or two from Kentucky. At Nashville, P. S. Fall, a native of England, and Campbell's best friend, has led off most of that church which was a member of Cumberland Association.

On Saturday before the first Lord's day in September, Willis Hopwood, as is expected, will be excluded, and perhaps most of Liberty Church, Bedford county, will follow him. Robertson's Fork Church, Giles county, will divide, and (probably) a number will follow Hopwood. Zion Church, Bedford county, I fear, will suffer much from the same *new* ancient gospel. Other churches may have some partial sifting. Many Arminian Campbellites and Masonic Unitarians have fled for refuge, (not to Christ.) The calf, too, is set up in Alabama, and already it is proclaimed, 'These be the gods that must bring us out of Babylon.' What shall I say? I have been thirty-three years in camps in Tennessee. I have fought many a hard battle under Christ's banner, and under Baptist colors. But never before have I seen such shuffling—such dissenting.

I am this day 59 years old. I have baptized about 1200 persons. When I am old and weak what shall I say? Give up the ship? No—never—never. Some say, If old Atkinson, old Whitsitt, and M'Connico were dead, the battle would be won. But, ah me! Jesus lives and will sustain his cause; and in this I rejoice. A good man once said, All these things make against me. But they all made for him.

The Lord reigns; let his servants fear. I am glad, brother Clopton, to see you march out against Goliath, who has been defying the armies of Israel. May the God of David direct the pebble from the sling, in this, the day of battle. I hope you will have the prayers of the godly. I have seen some two or three of your numbers. God bless the man and the means. If I were able I would hold up your hands while you fight the battles of the Lord. I fear many of the floating *neutrality* amongst the ministry will not support you. Fear not. Thus some of David's brethren thought that the pride of his heart had induced him to come forward in single combat. I hope, my brother, your beard is grown. I, for one, will not fear, though you meet the uncircumcised Philistine; for I know that the Lord is mighty in battle. GARNER M'CONNICO

*Elders A. W. Clopton and Thomas Jeffries.*

## REMARKS.

The foregoing is, in substance, the letter of Mr. M'Connico. While no idea has been changed, a few verbal alterations have been made. The writer is believed to be a faithful, eminently successful, and justly distinguished minister of the Lord Jesus Christ. Mr. Campbell inveighs much against learned Doctors of Divinity, except when they happen to suit his purpose. The writer of this letter has attained to his excellency in the ministry, through the grace of God, upon a diligent cultivation of his powers, without the aid of a collegiate or academical education. He is therefore free from all suspicion of a combination with what Mr. Campbell calls the learned priesthood. He has read carefully and impartially Mr. Campbell's writings. He gives him full credit for his talent in polemical disputation. He has had a personal interview and a twelve hours conversation with him. He has heard him *preach*. He has been an eye witness to the fruits resulting from the introduction of his writings among the churches. He knows well the meaning of a revival of the "ancient order of things." He has had a direct and personal acquaintance and intercourse with some of his proselytes. He has had the fairest opportunity of trying their "spirits." Their principles he has tested by their practices—their sayings by their doings. His language may be thought, by some, to be marked with a degree of asperity unsuited to the subject. But he was aware that the circumstances in which he was placed, the occasion which induced him to speak and write, forbade every thing like Jesuitical trimming. It is now more important than ever, that things be called by their appropriate names. His language is a burst of honest and holy indignation at the course pursued by those who have broken up the peace and harmony formerly existing in the churches with which he was connected.

He sees his children bewitched and carried away by *another* gospel. He therefore speaks and writes as one who believes truth to be *something*. His language to Mr. Campbell is honest, bold, decisive. The tergiversation in Mr. Campbell's replies may satisfy his admirers, if not the "floating neutrality." These considerations ought, in my judgment, to give weight to the opinions of Mr. M'Connico; and more especially when those opinions are sanctioned by two such aged and distinguished ministers as John Atkinson and John Whitsitt. Under circumstances perhaps equally favorable to a correct decision, they too have formed the same opinion concerning Mr. Campbell and his scheme of religion.

After a careful perusal of the newly translated Testament, Mr. M'Connico's conclusion is, that it is well suited to the *religious* infidelity of the Unitarian compiler. He is not singular in the opinion that Mr. Campbell is a Unitarian. And he stands not alone in the belief that Campbellism is a scheme of *religious* infidelity, dangerous to the souls of men, and to the real prosperity of the church of Christ, just in proportion as it *seems* to wear the garb, and to speak the language of *real* believers. Respecting the mournful scenes of heresy, strife, alienation, and schism, depicted in this letter, no additional re-

marks can be necessary. From the bare recital of them the heart of christian sensibility recoils with holy aversion—with holy indignation. Their promulgation to the world can be justified on no other ground but a strong persuasion that others equally exposed to dangers, and equally at a loss how to proceed, may, in this way, be awakened to vigilance, and if visited by the desolating scourge, know how to act. They all speak the same language. They all point to the same *prime* agent. They all require the same remedy—if that may be called a remedy which can only mitigate and not heal—palliate but not *cure* the deadly wounds. These churches and Associations, as well as those in Kentucky, are convinced, after long and painful experiment, that nothing short of a thorough purging of the floor—that nothing short of a distinct and total separation from *all such*, can promise relief. ABNER W. CLOPTON.

It would seem that Mr. Clopton thought his brother M'Connico's letter in need of burnishing, altering, and amending, to make it *suit* his views. It lost nothing of its defamatory character in so good hands. There was not a monk in the cloisters of the Mother of Harlots, who could not have written many such letters against the Lutheran Reformation. And many a Jew could have defamed Paul full as well as these children of Calvinism and Fullerism have defamed me. "Religious infidel," "Unitarian compiler," "Alexander the coppersmith," are strong arguments against me. So were "the ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes," "pestilent fellow," "sower of sedition," "a teacher of heresy," strong arguments against Paul. Messrs. M'Connico and Whitsitt sail under "Baptist colors" as it appears, and have "letters of marque and reprisal." They are now privateering on the high seas, and have waged an interminable war against Campbellism. I am just about starting to their own country, and will join them in a crusade against Campbellism. But if they thus nickname the ancient gospel, we must beg leave to expose their error, not by a war of epithets, but by the sword of the Spirit and the good arguments which it suggests to us. But having fought thirty years under the flag of Calvinism, and having nailed the colors to the mast, Mr. M'Connico and his two friends are resolved *never to give up that ship.* The fact of having so long preached that faith, is, no doubt, the strongest argument these gentlemen have to offer for continuing to preach it.

As for this "shuffling, lying, slandering, evil speaking," &c. of which Mr. M'Connico speaks, we shall inquire into it a little more particularly, especially as it is now *exparte* testimony. But if any man advocating the ancient gospel should be guilty of such fashionable sins, for my part I will have no fellowship with him, though in his *sixtieth* year, and the father of "many ill-begotten children."

As for Mr. Clopton's "*holy* indignation," it is so much like his "elevated tone of *piety*," that we place them in the same chapter.

Mr. Clopton's proofs that I am unsound in the faith, have received three accessions or new arguments. These are the opinions of Messrs. M'Connico, Whitsitt, and Atkinson. Three logical arguments truly!

ED. M. H.

*From the Gospel Luminary.*

## DR. COX ON REGENERATION.

DR. COX, a respectable Presbyterian minister of this city, preached a sermon before the Synod of New York, on the subject of Regeneration, sometime last autumn. In this sermon, the Doctor commenced a bold and direct attack upon some of the leading doctrines of Calvinism. The sermon under consideration has been reviewed by the Princeton Biblical Repertory, and by the New Haven Christian Spectator, both of which are regarded as orthodox periodicals. We have adverted to this subject for the purpose of showing that the work of reform is gradually progressing among the Presbyterians, and also to show that there is no such uniformity of sentiment among them, as a body, as many pretend.

Dr. Cox says in his sermon:—

"One of the capital mistakes in theology, one that has been valued as a limb of orthodoxy, but which may well be viewed as the great paralyzer of preaching, is that of the alleged *passivity* of the subject in regeneration. This mistake has been adopted superficially, from a dark and technical regard to the doctrine of election and its kindred truths: by false principles of interpretation, since the Bible teaches no such doctrine; and with an officious care to exclude all self-complacency from christians. But error and ignorance correct nothing; and our grand weapon of warfare is *truth*. Now if it be a fact that the soul is just as *active* in regeneration as in any other thing—as it is before or after that glorious event—then, what shall we call that kind of orthodoxy that proposes to make men better by teaching them the reverse? To paralyze the soul, or to strike it through with a moral panic, is not regeneration. But to bring it to "hear the word of Christ, and believe on him that sent him," and so to pass (or, as we prefer to render it, to make transition) "from death unto life;" this is regeneration."—p. 24.

"If it be said that the Spirit of God produces regeneration, I answer, True; but what is regeneration? Is it something done *to* the subject, and not done *by* him? This view will, I know, quadrate with some technicalities of the books; I know, also, that it is technically wretched, philosophically wrong, and theologically false."—p. 25.

"Perhaps it will be said that God creates or inserts some *holy principle* in us, which constitutes regeneration, and in which we are entirely passive; but that thereafter we actively do our duty. I reply, that it can command the confidence of no well-disciplined mind. By "holy principle," I mean love to God, and not any thing *antecedent* to it; and by love to God, I mean *loving him;* and in that the subject is active. In short, there is no such thing as a holy principle antecedent to it; or distinguishable from, *active*, mental holiness." —p. 26.

To this the Princeton reviewers reply:—

"We do not see how it is possible to hold together the tattered shreds of Calvinism, if this ground be assumed.—p. 266. We are at a loss to see how this theory is to be reconciled with the Calvinist's

doctrine of the will.—p. 277. That the denial of the sinner's blindness to the holiness of God is involved in it, is perfectly evident.—p. 285. Dr. Cox asks whether it is not "intrinsically absurd," that a man should be regenerated before he does his duty? We think the absurdity is all the other way, that he should do his duty without being regenerated.—p. 286. Dr. Cox speaks of this "certain kind of principle," as a mysterious gratuity with which the receiver has nothing to do. We are persuaded that a *fundamental* difference, as to the nature of *agency*, and *human liberty*, lies at the foundation of all such objections. We are yet *fighting in the dark*. The real turning point is yet in the back ground."—p. 287.

"The truth is, that the whole system is a forced and unnatural union between *Arminian* philosophy and Calvinistic facts; a union which can neither be peaceful nor lasting.—p. 192. That this principle [*i. e.* moral character belonging only to *acts* of choice] is inconsistent with the doctrine of original righteousness, is formally admitted. That it involves the denial of original sin, as the doctrine has been commonly held among Calvinists, is equally clear. According to the prevalent doctrine on this subject, original sin consists, first, in the imputation of Adam's sin; this, it seems, *has been long exploded:* secondly, in the want of original righteousness; *this is gone* too; for there never was any such thing: and thirdly, in the corruption of nature, that is, a tendency to do what God has prohibited, [and nothing else,] existing *prior* to all acts of choice, and independently of them; and *now this is gone.*"—p. 292. [Alas! for the tattered shreds of Calvinism!]

"But to return to our subject. This theory not only overthrows the doctrines which we have just mentioned, but it throws the Spirit's influences almost out of view. We think the grace of God acts a part scarcely more conspicuous in all this scheme, than it does in the enumeration of the titles of a European monarch."—p. 294. "As to the point which Dr. Cox thinks so "intrinsically absurd," and about which he says so much, whether man is *passive* in regeneration, it will be seen that, for its own sake, *it does not merit a moment's discussion.* It depends entirely on the previous questions; whether there is not a holy "relish," taste, or *principle* produced in the soul *prior*, in the order of nature, to any holy *act* of the soul itself. To relinquish *this point*, will cost us a struggle. It will be giving up the main point of debate between the friends and opposers of the *doctrines of grace*, from Augustine to the present day. We have no doubt Dr. Cox believes these doctrines. What we lament is, that he should seem to advocate a principle which we fear is *subversive of them all.*"—p. 295, 296, 297.

Such is the language by which the Princeton reviewers rebuke Dr. Cox, and those who agree with him in sentiment. But the reviewers of New Haven speak of Dr. Cox's sermon in very different terms. After eulogizing him as "a powerful preacher," and representing the question at issue as "the most important in the whole range of christian theology," the reviewer says, "Perhaps the solu-

tion of this single question may be the pivot on which shall turn whole systems of divinity; the radiating point, from which may shoot off rays into whole regions of surrounding twilight and midnight darkness. After quoting such scriptures as these, "*Seek* and you shall find," "*Come* unto me, and I will give you rest," they ask,

"Now, in reading these passages—and they have reference to the very point in debate, the commencement of religion in the soul;—would it ever occur that they regarded man in any other light than as being *active* in the entire work of religion? Do they look as if the sacred penmen ever considered their minds as mere *passive* recipients in any part of this work? Do they not speak as men do on other subjects when they express activity? And is not the natural language of these expressions, that the mind is as far as possible from stagnation, or torpor, or "moral panic?" Let it be remembered also, that they speak of the actings of the mind in *all* the changes which it experiences in religion. There is nothing in the charge of which they speak, *anterior* to ACTION; no department of the moral man in which christianity obtains a lodgment, that is not expressed by language describing man's own agency."—p. 330.

Again, we should not probably agree with them in their views of election, yet we can heartily subscribe to the language which they use in controversy with the "old Calvinists;" language that would have sounded strangely in Presbyterian ears a few years ago.

"What is the doctrine of election, on the theory of our opponents? That a part of mankind are taken to eternal life, in consequence of a change of heart, in which they had no share. That the remainder sink to hell for *wanting that which did depend upon themselves*—for wanting "a holy principle" distinct from, and independent of, any act of their own—and for wanting *influence of God*, by which such a principle is created in the breast of the redeemed! With exactly the same justice might any man be condemned to perdition for wanting talents, beauty or wealth. These are the representations of the doctrine of election, which have made it so odious in many parts of our land. Every principle of man's nature rises up against such statements. They make the whole system of the doctrines of grace a loathing and an abhorrence to thousands. They steel the hearts of multitudes against the influence of divine truth. Other multitudes they place in the attitude of *passive recipients*, waiting for some mysterious gift distinct from their own agency. With entire respect, and with personal affection for many who make these statements, we are compelled to say, that, in our view, they take upon themselves a tremendous responsibility in so doing. Woe to that minister of God, who, in his name, proclaims to men to wait in the solemn duties of their souls, for the expected aid of the Almighty, or to delay the effort for repentance till he shall send them new powers or principles of action from on high. In all the oracles of truth not one such direction is found."—p. 357.

We shall make one more quotation from the Review at New Haven, for the purpose of giving the views which the conductors of that peri-

odical hold respecting faith. They are precisely those which we entertain ourselves on this subject:—

"When we look at faith, without reference to any theological debate, we see nothing that is particularly mysterious about it as an operation of the mind; nothing which by any inherent properties separates it from the usual actings of moral agency. It is belief in testimony; that is, credit given to truth, according to evidence, implying *action* in looking at this evidence, and in coming to the result. In all this we see only the actings of the mind. Take away that *act of mind*—the *putting forth* of confidence, trust, or belief, and what remains? There is nothing tangible or conceivable, but the act of the mind. A child puts confidence in a parent's promise. This is faith. He relies on him in the hour of danger; he fears when he threatens. That is also faith. But besides this act of the mind in the child, there is nothing that can be detected or conceived of in relation to the subject, that deserves praise or blame. So of the christian. All that we know of this crowning christian grace is, that the man believes, hopes, loves, fears, puts trust in God."

"But it is said that faith is the gift of God. This is true. And so are repentance, love, hope, and peace, the gift of God, and in the same sense, and to the same extent. The passage of scripture which says, "For by grace are you saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God," may perhaps be objected to the view here given. But it should be remembered that while the sentiment which *appears* to be taught there is true, it is not the truth which *that* passage contains. In the original the word "*that*" refers not to *faith*, but to the *salvation by grace*. It would be correctly rendered, 'You are saved by grace through faith, and this *salvation by grace* through faith is not of yourselves, it is the gift of God'—a sentiment not asserting any thing peculiar in the gift of faith above other graces."

"To this view of faith we know there is presented a difficulty in the technicalities of some systems of theology, drawn we believe from erroneous views of the philosophy of the mind. It is, that anterior to the exercise of faith, apart from it, and capable of distinct contemplation, and of course responsibility, there is a *principle* of faith implanted in regeneration. This is the counterpart of the doctrine of physical depravity; of a concreated principle of evil; and is what cannot be admitted as true."—353, 354.

The foregoing quotations are sufficient to show that the work of reform is still in progress among the Presbyterians—that the standard of orthodoxy is gradually lowering; and that a more liberal and rational system of theology is prevailing among them; and we are confident that it must continue to prevail. The dogmas of Calvinism, even among Presbyterians, are becoming unpopular, and must, ere long, sink to rise no more. This controversy is also an additional evidence to prove that the boasted power of creeds to preserve uniformity of faith in a religious body, is but the mere artifice of sectarians to urge the claims of partyism, and that creeds in reality possess no such power; for there always has, and must continue to be, a vari-

ety of sentiments on religious subjects in the same body. From the force of education, from the degrees of knowledge which have been acquired, from the accustomed modes and habits of thinking which have been adopted, and from our constitutional temperament which is but partially understood, the light of truth shining upon the understanding under these various influences, produces different shades of reflections. From hence we argue that creeds are entirely powerless to preserve uniformity of faith, any further than they dispose persons to take things on trust; and so far as they do this, they are prejudicial to vital christianity.

## To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.

### ELIAS SMITH.

I HAVE recently read the "LIFE OF ELIAS SMITH," 405 pages, 12mo. published A. D. 1816. I cannot but regard him as a good man, and as having been persecuted for righteousness' sake. He was born, he tells us, June 19th, 1769, in the town of LYME, in Connecticut—parents poor—advantages for education quite limited; but well improved. In the month of May, 1789, he was baptized by Elder William Grow, a Baptist minister—subsequently became a Baptist preacher himself. Dr. Baldwin preached at his ordination. He was installed at Woburn, Mass. November, 1798. Preached up Calvinistic election. Observing the bad effects, he was led to a careful and candid examination of the doctrine—result; that it was not the doctrine of Christ, and determined to give it up as wrong—soon after this, reduced all his religion to two things: "*Believe right*, and *Do right*." "This," says he, "laid the foundation for examining every part of doctrine by the Scriptures; and in consequence of this, for many years, the ignorant, the partial, and the dishonest, have considered me a heretic, and some have said, *Not fit to live*." Treated badly at W—Left—Read some Universalist works —embraced Universalism for fifteen days, and then renounced it, and with this, all other *isms* for the name Christian, and the doctrine of Christ. Preached at Portsmouth, N. H. September 10th, 1804, through the influence of Dr. Baldwin, the church in Woburn voted to withdraw the hand of fellowship from him: previous to this he withdrew from them. And as they gave no reason why, he thought it a duty to give the public the reasons in a pamphlet that year. The reasons were, *seven* unscriptural things they held, which he denied:—

"1. Their name *Baptists*.

"2. *Articles*, which are an addition to the perfect law of liberty.

"3. *Association of Churches*, which is contrary to the New Testament.

"4. Holding the necessity of a *college education* to be ministers of the gospel.

"5. *Missionary Societies*.

"6. *Councils* to ordain ministers and settle disputes

"7. *Installing* and re-installing ministers."

It appears from this work, that the first *Christian* church in the United States was formed in Portsmouth, N. H. in March, 1803: the second, in Boston in the Spring of 1804.

*I copy the following, on the Trinity, from pages* 106–7–8–9.

"There was one man who improved them by the name of *Victorious Smith*. Mr. S. undertook to preach in the forenoon. He was a man of great moderation as to words; or rather, slow of speech, and a slow tongue. After the usual form of singing and praying, he stood up and read for his text the following words: Acts xx. 8. *And there were many lights in the upper chamber where they were gathered together.* I wondered why he took such a text to preach from, and was at a loss what he would do with it, besides showing that Paul did not preach in a dark room though he preached in the night. The man discovered some invention which was peculiar to himself. He did not first divide his text into propositions, but mentioned one at a time. *First*, he said, he should prove that the house was three stories high, though it was but one house. He said it was evident that the house was three stories high, because Eutychus fell down from the third loft. This statement I doubted, and still doubt: for a loft signifies rooms on high; and if there were three lofts, there must be one room on the ground. Having thus proved that the house was three stories high, and yet but one house; he stated, *secondly*, that Noah's ark was three stories high, and yet but one ark. This proposition took me from Troas where Paul preached, to Mount Ararat where the ark rested. He gave some description of the ark, told us that the beasts were in the first story, the birds in the second, and Noah and his family in the third. Next he called our attention to 1 John, v. 7. "For there are *three* that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." Having read this text, he stated, *thirdly*, that there were three persons in the godhead, and yet but one God. The man discovered some ingenuity in his discourse, as he brought such things to prove the doctrine called *the trinity*, as perhaps were never brought before nor since. At that time I did not know that such a doctrine was ever disputed, and of course thought it proved very well. As there is no scripture for such a doctrine as this, that three persons are one person, the lighted chamber where Paul preached, and Noah's ark are as much proof of it, as any other text in the Bible; and 1 Chron. i. 1. "*Adam, Seth, Enos*," is as much proof of it, as what he or any other man can bring from the Bible. The people sat very contented to hear *the trinity* illustrated from the supposed three-storied house, Noah's ark, and 1 John, v. 7. Some, after meeting, told me they did not see into the subject."

*A Conversation with his Uncle Elisha Ransom, a Baptist Preacher, on* Words, (*p.* 139—141.) *is thus described.*—

"The last part of his conversation at that time was upon Words; and though he did not talk long, what he said has been of great use to me from that day till now. He stated that it was of importance to know the meaning of words, and the different things often meant by

one word. He quoted what Solomon said, "The preacher sought to find out acceptable words; and that which was written was upright, even words of truth." He quoted the writings of Paul: "Let no man deceive you with vain words." "Hold fast the form of sound words." "With good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple." "Charge them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit; but to the subverting of the hearers." After quoting these places of Scripture upon words; he observed that there were many words used not found in the Scriptures, and many Scripture words used not as the writers used them; and that to know the meaning of a word, we must know what the author meant when he used the word. When you read, said he, the word *righteousness*, *atonement*, *hope*, *salvation*, *grace*, *truth*, or any such word, find the subject that word is used to convey. In this way, said he, you will be rich in ideas, as well as words; for he who only knows words is like one who always deals in empty vessels; you must go to some other if you are hungry. All this looked rational, and I then resolved to attend to what he said. That conversation has been of great use to me.

"In the first part of public speaking it was my constant study to know the meaning of important words used in the Scriptures, and to give their meaning to my hearers. For several years past, remembering what my uncle said, (that there are many words used, not in the Scriptures,) I have taken particular notice of the words used to describe doctrines which are not in the Bible, and have endeavored to point them out in speaking and writing, which has greatly enraged many who consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ. This instruction on words, laid the foundation for writing my New Testament Dictionary, in which the most important words are noticed; the subject stated, contained in words; and unscriptural words named and left behind.

"For the instruction of others, particularly young preachers, I here observe, that many words are now in use to describe some principal part of doctrine, which are not in the Scriptures; this often causes strife and contention. If the word is used to express a subject in the Bible, the word used in the Bible to express that subject is better than an unscriptural word. If the word and doctrine are both unscriptural, it is in vain to undertake to prove from the Bible, that which is not once named in it. The word *trinity* is an unscriptural word, and so is the doctrine, and we may as well prove purgatory from the Bible as the trinity: for neither of them are mentioned there. There are some scriptural words which are used to describe what is not named in the Bible. *Baptism* is one. It is in the Bible but there is no account of baptizing infants; and all said in favor of that is invention.

☞"WHEN PREACHERS ARE WILLING TO LEAVE UNSCRIPTURAL WORDS AND UNSCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES, FOR THE WORDS OF CHRIST, AND THE PLAIN EXPRESS DOCTRINE OF CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES, JARS AND CONTENTIONS WILL CEASE, AND ALL WILL CONSENT TO WHOLESOME WORDS, AND THE DOCTRINE WHICH IS ACCORDING TO GODLINESS."

The hand and underscoring of this last sentence are mine. No preaching, I think, can be truer than this; and I would that it were inscribed in golden letters on every pulpit in christendom.

In pages 399, 400, 401, Mr. Smith inserts and replies to a notice given of him by Mr. Benedict in his History of the Baptists, p. 411. From this and other such like misrepresentations of his enemies, previous to reading his life written by himself, I formed my opinion of *Elias Smith*. My opinion now is changed. F.

## INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

*No. I.*

ON Tuesday, the 26th of October, started from Bethany, in company with brother *Samuel Parmley*, of New York, on a tour through Ohio and Kentucky to Nashville, Tennessee. Wednesday was chiefly spent in attending to sundry items of business in Wheeling. Thursday evening found us in Cambridge. During the day sundry topics of conversation, among which was, the best system of education which could be adopted in the present state of society, with a reference to our political institutions. The following is a condensed view of the sentiments advanced on the subject of

### EDUCATION.

The education of youth has long been confessed to be an object of paramount importance, supremely worthy of the greatest attention of parents and of every wise and benevolent government on earth. If the object of government be, as is generally confessed in this country, to protect the life, liberty, reputation, and property of every citizen in the community, the education of youth in literature and morals, as it is the most effectual means to promote these high ends of civilized government; so it, chief of all, and above every thing else, deserves and calls for the collective wisdom and combined energy of the whole government. Yet to our shame it must be confessed that this subject, in most of the state governments of these enlightened states, receives little or no attention; and in not one of the states does it receive that attention which it merits. Millions are annually squandered by some twenty-five legislating assemblies who spend a part of every winter in enacting laws against evil doers of every class in the schools of vice and immorality. These multifarious laws, like spiders' webs, are spun so fine that they catch only the flies, while wasps and hornets dash through them, regardless of the feeble restraints which they oppose to their course. Crimes and immoralities are not prevented by immense codes of laws. They are known to be abundant in every country in proportion to the size and number of the volumes of legislative enactments against them. A government which promises to itself the suppression of vice, immorality, and crime, by numerous laws, jails, and penitentiaries, reasons as fallaciously as the king who promised peace to his country on condition they augmented the army and the navy, erected fortifications, and arsenals, according to the number of his enemies. The multiplication of law is always the

multiplication of transgression. The laws of England are so numerous, that had not many of them become obsolete, a person could scarcely take a morning walk, enjoy the light of the sun, or taste the sweetness of the balmy zephyrs of a summer's evening, without subjecting himself to some penalty. And if our *twenty-five* law-making factories continue annually to swell the code for a generation to come, it will be as impossible for any man to keep the whole law of the state, as it is affirmed by some to be to keep the whole law of Moses, though that contained but ten commandments. Our lawgivers in this country have one great advantage, it is true, over the wise lawgivers of ancient times. It is fashionable here for one legislative assembly to declare void, or to annul the laws, the acts, and deeds of that which preceded it. This, owing to our wise institutions, can be done without in the least reflecting upon the wisdom or integrity of them who enacted them. This is our anchor of hope against the probability of one day being doomed to a series of penalties ruinous to our estates, if not detrimental to our lives.

But it is not in laws to remove ignorance, the fruitful parent of vice; and, therefore, it is not in laws, however wise or good, to reform men, nor to prevent the commission of crime. If we could learn any thing from the example of other governments and other nations, one would think that England alone would have enlightened christendom on this subject. She has made what we would call *petty larceny* a capital crime. Hundreds of her unfortunate inhabitants, citizens we cannot call them, have given their lives a ransom for a theft of fifty cents in our currency. But has the severity of the law, and the cruelty of the penalty diminished even the lesser thefts? No country on earth more abounds with evil doers of this school than England, with her common law, her statute law, her courts, her august tribunals, her acts of Parliament, her jails, her prison ships, her Botany Bay, her remote and inhospitable places of transportation. The law causes the offence to abound. Judea and England have proved this doctrine long ago.

Ignorance, the parent of idleness and vice, must be dispossessed. Schools, not jails—school-masters, and not legislators, are wanting for this purpose. Four-fifths of the convicts in some of our penitentiaries cannot read.

The plan which we had to propose in the Virginia Convention for this purpose, still appears to us the most eligible for the present state of society: not for a better state of society, but for the present state of society. But there were few ears in that body disposed to hear a word upon the subject. It was a scramble for power. It was not what system of arrangements, what constitutional provisions will make the happiest population; but how shall we of the East retain our dominion over the West; and how shall we of the West obtain that equal share of power in the government to which we are, in justice, entitled? This question, like Pharaoh's ill-favored kine, devoured every thing, fat or well-favored, which appeared in the Convention.

The plan, in its great outlines, embraced the following *principles*, and would have required the following details, had it been discussed, or

carried into effect. The cardinal *principles* on which it sought to be based are these:—

1. Ignorance is the parent of idleness, and this becomes the fruitful source of immorality and crime of every gradation.

2. To *prevent* crime is much wiser than to *punish* it.

3. Government having for its object the *prevention* rather than the *punishment* of crime; the preservation of life, liberty, reputation, and property, rather than the punishment of infractions upon these, ought, if it act wisely, to devote its energies to the erection and maintenance of the safeguards of life, liberty, reputation, and property, which, it is agreed on all hands, are INTELLIGENCE AND VIRTUE.

4. Schools and seminaries of learning, well conducted and sustained, are essential, in every community, to the expulsion of ignorance, and the promotion of intelligence and virtue.

5. They are, therefore, the most necessary, useful, and every way appropriate objects of legislation, and of governmental supervision, protection, and support; and as such, ought to be sustained by all the same means by which government is sustained and the expences thereof borne.

The details would have embraced, among others, the following:—

1. The whole territory of the state, the land and personal property, shall be subject to such imposts, levies, or taxes, as are sufficient to educate well every child born within the commonwealth.

2. There shall be one University in the state, in which all the languages, arts, and sciences, comprising the most liberal education, shall be taught; and as many common schools as will make it convenient for all the children in every vicinity, to attend.

3. The Professors of this University, and all the teachers of the common schools shall be paid by the state. The principal use of the University to the state, besides affording a liberal education to all who attend it, will be to furnish teachers for the common schools, not merely by educating them, but to hold two examinations every year, at which, whosoever attends, whether taught in that University or in any other school, or self-taught, and shall, on examination, be found to possess the knowledge of any science, or department of literature, he shall receive a diploma, or certificate, signed by the beard of examinators of said University, attesting such attainments; and in a given time after the establishment of said University no person shall be employed in any common school as a teacher, who cannot produce a certificate from the state University declaring his competency.

The chief objection to this system will be its expensiveness to the community. But it can be easily shown that not a state in this union would have, under such a system, to pay more than the present amount of taxes added to what is already paid for education. The commonwealth of Virginia, for example, has formerly paid about 100,000 dollars per annum for legislation alone; less than the half of which would give her wiser and more equal laws and acts in biennial meetings of less than half the number of her former legis-

lators: that is, 50,000 dollars every two years, wisely expended, would pay for all necessary legislation. Add this single item of rational economy, viz. 75,000 dollars per annum, to the sums already paid by her citizens for education, and it will, under a judicious system, educate all the children in the commonwealth. But were it deficient, other savings and other investments of capital, which any state could soon raise, would make it no more expensive to educate the whole, than it now is to educate, very imperfectly too, a part of the children of the state.

Some have an objection against educating the children of the indolent and vicious poor. But let such remember that they had better expend a little on the education of their children, than so much as they now expend for laws to make themselves no safer, and the vicious poor no better. More money is now paid by the virtuous and industrious part of the community on account of this vicious mass of ignorance, idleness, and crime, without relieving the community from it, or improving it in the least, than would be sufficient to banish it out of the land altogether, by the proper means.

And let the most avaricious citizen reflect that, although he is able to educate his own children, and considers himself oppressed when he has to pay for the education of the poor, he is thereby accomplishing two great objects:—First, he is defending his offspring from the infractions of ignorance and crime by removing them out of the country; and in the second place, all he pays annually, under such a system, would be only paid in advance for his own poor descendants: for in two or three generations, under the present system, they must sink to poverty and ignorance; but under this system they would not so likely become poor; and if poor, they could not be deprived of education, which is more than half that any wise man can wish for his posterity as respects this present life. The terror of poverty is ignorance. But divorce ignorance from poverty, and it has lost its sting. View this subject, then, in whatever light we may, it has every thing to recommend it. Nothing is, or can be arrayed against it, except the spirit of aristocracy, which builds its castles and decorates itself upon the spoils of ignorance and crime. There must be many huts to afford one castle; and many an unlettered swain is necessary, as the shade in the picture, to give a brighter lustre to a few Solomons in an age or a kingdom.

---

During the evening of Thursday was finished the essay on Metaphysical Regeneration, No. 3. Friday, the 29th, brought us to Zanesville before 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Soon as we arrived, I employed a lad to notify the citizens that at candlelighting in the evening I would speak in the court-house, (which was already tendered by the Sheriff,) and sent to Mr. *Sedwick** a note in the words following:—

*Mr. Sedwick is opposed to reformation. He edits a monthly Regular Baptist Miscellany, full of every thing "common among the Baptists." It is decidedly the leanest thing in all the land, and is now seeking to fatten itself by publishing every thing it can collect from all quarters, against the ancient gospel and the ancient order of things.

"Mr. Sedwick,

"*Dear Sir*—Having arrived in your town of Zanesville, and consequently within the diocess of your supervision; and being solicited to deliver a discourse to the citizens of Zanesville, I thought it due you, from the notice you have taken of me, to apprize you of my arrival. Should there be any cause, on account of which you might desire to see me, and to have an interview with me, it will give me pleasure to see you at my lodgings, at Mr. S. Hughes' Hotel, where I shall continue during the night; and believe me to be ever disposed to give all satisfaction to all those who have aught to interrogate me touching those things which are now so generally the subject of inquiry and discussion.

"Your obedient servant,

"A. CAMPBELL."

"*Zanesville*, 29th October, 1830."

Mr. Sedwick was kind enough to call at my lodgings, and leave an invitation for me to call at his house, which I could not accept, promising to call again and accompany me to meeting. He called a few minutes before the hour appointed, and accompanied us to the court-house, where we found a small congregation assembled. The information not having been general, comparatively few of the citizens attended.

The conclusion of the Testimony of Matthew Levi was read, our object being to strike at the root of the popular prejudice in favor of a specially called order of expositors; to persuade the people that the Scriptures were an intelligible book; to state that gospel by which the nations were to be converted to God, and to illustrate the apostolic practice under this commission by an examination of one of their discourses. In the prosecution of this complex object, the following propositions were stated and illustrated:—

1. *That the Apostles could have no successors.* inasmuch as the qualifications for their office, as stated by Peter, (Acts i.) were such as none after them could possess; the work itself given them in charge was so far executed as to require none invested with the same office to succeed them; they having taught the disciples every thing given them in charge. They literally planted churches in Asia, Africa, and Europe; fully announced the reign of God; and if they did not wholly convert all the nations, they proclaimed the gospel and set on foot the institutions which are to convert every man who is to be adopted into the family of God. The impropriety of supposing any preachers or teachers to be their successors, *officially*, was represented by allusions to all the civil offices known among men. The successor of a magistrate, governor, or president, is a *magistrate*, *governor*, or *president*, holding the same office, with all its powers and immunities; consequently if the Apostles have any successors, they are *Apostles* too.

It was demonstrated that the arrogant pretensions of the papacy and prelacy originated in the assumption of apostolic succession; or in the plea that the Apostles must have successors of some sort. It

was also shown that all the sects less or more favored the idea by claiming for their teachers some official authority, by virtue of the commission given to the original witnesses of the resurrection, whose office it was to plant churches and teach the christian institution.

2. *That as God had spoken to men in their own language, by his Son and by these Apostles, it followed that in order to make his communications worthy of the character of a* REVELATION, *he must have used our words in the commonly received sense; for to have taken our words and to have appropriated to them a peculiar and hidden meaning, would have been not to enlighten, but to confound the human understanding.*

The inference was, that the words and phrases found in the New Testament were to be interpreted by the common rules of interpretation applied to all writings of the same antiquity; or, indeed, to any human writings, ancient or modern. That the literal passages were to be understood literally; and the figurative passages figuratively, as in all human compositions. That the words *faith, hope, love, repentance, regeneration*, &c. were in the world before the christian era, and were used in the same sense by the inspired speakers and writers as was current in those days.

Occasion was taken here to show the irrational and unmeaning assumptions of many professing to be called to interpret the Scriptures, by no rules, or by rules of their own invention. That the word of God was made of non-effect by the pretence that it required two other revelations to make it intelligible—a new revelation of the Spirit, and a revelation from the Clergy was suggested, and in proof of which, arguments and appeals to the experience of the thoughtful were tendered. The Clergy represent *three* revelations as necessary—the written word, the physical influence of the Spirit, and the erudition and spiritual understanding of the preachers.

A brief history of the rise and progress of the Man of Sin was here presented, and the means by which he was to be *consumed*, and finally *destroyed*, descanted upon. The dark ages and the effects of the *inductive* science were introduced to illustrate the changes now in progress, and to show the certain demolition of the reigning systems of superstition and enthusiasm admired and extolled by the partizan sectaries of this age.

3. *The gospel proclaimed to the nations to convert them by the Apostles, was glad tidings of great joy to all who understood and obeyed it. It was remission of all past sins on obeying the command of mercy, and an immediate adoption into the family of God, with the impartation of the spirit of sons and daughters of the living God.*

4. Peter's opening of the reign of grace, or his first promulgation of the gospel on Pentecost, was then read, with a few appropriate remarks. His answer to the inquiry of the believing penitents, (Acts ii. 38.) was then briefly descanted upon. The import of the question, "*What shall we do;*" the faith and penitence of the inquirers; and Peter's commandment to them, were distinctly stated. And the meeting closed.

The discourse seemed to be felt more by my friend Mr. Sedwick, than by any other person present; for it even moved his whole person, body, soul, and spirit; and as soon as I closed, he went on his way without so much as saying, *Good night!* The congregation retired without any other indication than a willingness to hear and to be better instructed in these matters.

On returning to our lodgings I sat down to write a letter.—— While employed in writing some gentlemen entered the room. Two of them, not knowing me, entered into a conversation respecting the discourse. "Did you hear Campbell this evening?" says Mr. H.

"No," replied Mr. A. "I had not time to go; and if I had, I dont know that I should go to hear such a man. He preaches down all preaching, and yet preaches himself. And I am told he holds to a perfect equality among all christians. I have heard that some private disciples, who say they agree with Campbell in his views of religion, meet every Sunday to celebrate the sacrament without any preacher."

A Presbyterian gentleman, to whom I had been introduced as an Elder of that church, entered into a conversation with that gentlemen in a low tone of voice, and I heard no more of it till I finished my letter.

After I finished I stepped up to the fire. The gentleman last alluded to introduced the two strangers to me. After the usual compellations I accosted Mr. A. saying, that I heard him state an objection to me which I hoped he would permit me to explain.

He apologized very much for offering it as he had done, and really wished, he said, for information on that which appeared to him a contradiction. I admitted his apology, and told him I should attend to it with pleasure.

In substance I remarked, that I found myself authorized from the New Testament to say, that every man who pretended to a special call to expound the Scriptures in the style of the modern sermonizers, was certainly self-deceived, and consequently a deceiver of others. To *preach* the gospel, I observed, was now a very ambiguous phrase. It meant to teach Calvinism, or Arminianism, or any *ism* which the preacher supposed to be orthodox. All such preaching and teaching, under the pretence of a divine call, I must, as a disciple of the Great Teacher, reject. Moreover, the Old and New Testament afforded neither command, nor precedent, nor logical inference, to favor a textuary, or the practice of taking a *sentence* and making it the theme of a sermon. In one word, there was no more countenance for expository sermons, or commenting harangues, or an order of men for such purposes, than for an order of Priests and Levites now to present offerings for the people. That it was always in season to call upon men to reform, so long as any were found living in rebellion; and that we never opposed any person in a public or private station who believed the gospel, wrought righteousness, and was intelligent in the christian scriptures, for proclaiming the ancient gospel to those ignorant of it; nor for calling upon men to regard the holy scriptures

in their proper character, as containing a revelation from God. That, for my part, I esteemed it my duty, from all the premises before me, to preach up the intelligibility, clearness, suitableness, and sufficiency of the holy scriptures to perfect the man of God, and to preach down all human systems, text-takers, sermon-makers, sectarian tenets, and every thing opposed to the plain, simple, ancient gospel, announced by the Apostles. But modern preaching, in its just acceptation, is antipodes to every thing which in ancient times obtained the reputation of preaching or teaching Jesus Christ.

"To all that I assent," says Mr. A. "I never saw the reasonableness nor the authority which is plead for the usual pulpit exhibitions. I now understand you, and concur with you in sentiment on that subject."

My Presbyterian friend very courteously interrogates me: "Do you think, Mr. Campbell, that the scriptures have not a *spiritual* meaning?"

A "*spiritual* meaning," contradistinguished from a *literal* meaning, or a *figurative* or *symbolic* meaning, I confess myself not to understand. A mystical or hidden meaning I know is ascribed to them. To the prophecies such a meaning may belong; but other than a literal or a figurative meaning in the historical and epistolary books I profess not to comprehend.

*Presbyterian.*—Does not Paul say that a natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit—that they are *spiritually* discerned; consequently, I think, must have a spiritual meaning.

That context, I replied, places this subject in a very clear light. Paul's physical or animal man—the mere philosopher of Greece or Rome—without the ideas and words suggested by the Spirit to the Apostles, and by them communicated to us; having nothing but his five senses to guide him, a pure natural man, without revelation, written or oral, could never obtain, nor apprehend the *spiritual things* (which the philosopher's eye never saw, his ear never heard, his heart never conceived,) suggested by the Spirit in the words and sentences spoken by the Apostles. Macknight, your own Dr. Macknight, renders the passage thus: "We Apostles have received the Spirit which comes from God, that we might know the things which are gifted to us by God; which things also we speak, not in words taught by human wisdom; but in words taught by the Holy Spirit, explaining spiritual things in spiritual words." The words, then, suggested by the Spirit represent *spiritual things;* BUT THESE SPIRITUAL THINGS ARE THE LITERAL MEANING OF THESE SPIRITUAL WORDS. Spiritual *words* represent spiritual *things*. This is, perhaps, what you understand by a spiritual meaning: if so, I agree in sentiment with you, but must dissent from your phraseology as unauthorized. I agree, however, with your Dr. Macknight.

*Presbyterian.*—Dr. Macknight was a great critic and a good divine. I cannot contradict him. But I fear if we should teach that the scriptures have not a spiritual meaning we should greatly mislead others and puzzle ourselves. I very well recollect what curious ideas

I once had upon such passages as these, "While I mused the fire did burn, and thus I spoke;" "A well of water within him springing up unto eternal life." How can I reconcile these—*fire* burning within, and a *well of water* springing up? If these have not a spiritual meaning I know of no meaning which they have. And, I think, without the Spirit such passages could not be rightly understood.

To this I rejoined: I now perceive that you call the meaning of a figure of speech its spiritual meaning, and that you suppose the illumination of the Spirit is necessary to understand figures of speech. But will you please consider that all writers, historians, orators, and poets, of all ages, use figures of speech; and do you think that there are not as strong and bold figures as these you have quoted, in Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Demosthenes, Tacitus, and Hume; and does it require any supernatural aid to interpret them? I admit, my dear sir, that in both Testaments there are many bold figures of speech, emblems, parables, types, all of which are as intelligible, however, as the figures, emblems, and parables of other writers, and are to be interpreted by the same rules which rhetoricians apply to all such expressions. This is not what theologians call the spiritual meaning. Their spiritual meaning is the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, giving to the words in the book neither a literal nor a figurative meaning; but a mystical or hidden meaning, which man or angel could not discover; —than which there is no opinion more detrimental to true religion.

Here the conversation turned to the debate with Mr. Owen and various works upon the evidences of christianity—the new theory of dew, rain, volcanic eruptions—geology, magnetism, and their bearings upon the truth of christianity. The clock finally admonished us that the witchful hour of night was approaching. We bade good night, and retired.

Saturday was spent in journeying to near New Lancaster. I read Fuller's Strictures on Sandemanianism, while brother Parmley drove the gig. During the evening wrote No. 4 on Metaphysical Regeneration, and retired to repose free from all earthly anxieties, under the serene influences of the full moon richly scattering its silver radiance over my couch. EDITOR.

## DIALOGUE WITH A JEW.

*Extract from my Memorandum Book,*

Containing a Dialogue between the Editor and Mr. *Judah*, the Ruler of a Synagogue of the Jews in Richmond, Va. while attending the Convention, in December, 1829.

MR. JUDAH having signified a desire to a friend in Richmond to have an interview with me, a party being invited at the house of a mutual friend, I was introduced to this venerable Jew, almost 70 years old, apparently in the health and vigor of 50.

After sitting down by his side, I said, I feel myself peculiarly happy in being seated by the side of a son of the Patriarch Abraham.

*Judah.*—And I am happy in becoming acquainted with one who so well defended the divine mission of Moses against the infidel Owen.

*Editor.*—Have you read the debate with Mr. Owen?

*Judah.*—I have carefully read it all, and have not a single objection to any thing in the first volume of it. So far as you argue the authenticity of the Jews' religion, your arguments are substantially such as our Rabbims use; and your stripping the Deists of their *natural religion* is one of the best things I have read from any Christian. You know I differ from you on the christian part of your argument; but one thing I will say to you, I have heard some of your lectures on the Christian religion since you came to the city, which, with what I have read from your pen on that subject, assure me that you teach the religion which Jesus and the Apostles taught, if I know any thing of the meaning of what the New Testament says. And let me add, you are the only Christian preacher I have heard in a long life that does not abuse us poor Jews. I was wont to attend the Christian meetings in Richmond, but was constrained to abandon them because of the insults offered to us Jews.

*Editor.*—I never can reproach a Jew. We Gentiles are debtors to the seed of Abraham for all that gives us elevation of character; and although the remnant of your people were to be treated as you say the Christian preachers now treat them, and your own Prophets foretold; still I never will be the person who will speak contumeliously of a Jew as such. For your Fathers' sake I must always respect your nation; and glad would I be if your reproach among the nations was taken away. But there are a few questions which I would wish to propose to you for my own information.

*Judah.*—It will give me pleasure to answer them.

*Editor.*—Do you continue to read the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms in your Synagogues, as your people were accustomed to do at, and before, the Christian era?

*Judah.*—In our Synagogues every Sabbath day the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms are read, and all once through every year—just as you stated in your debate with Owen. We have these sacred writings divided into weekly lessons, and so divided as to make, in all, only *fifty-two* lessons.

*Editor.*—You have not much time for "preaching," then, as we Christians call it.

*Judah.*—No, nor much need for your sort of preaching or expounding. We *hear* Moses and the Prophets. We chant the Psalms of David, and invoke the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But we have no sermons. Sometimes an exhortation is tendered; but it is short, and only occasional. We teach our children the Law, without creed or catechism. We often hear in your Christian Synagogues sermons upon a sentence in Moses or the Prophets, very unlike, however, what Moses or the Prophets taught. Your preachers make all our scriptures *typical*, and your own too. They often fault our Rabbims, and talk about the traditions of our Elders; but I find that Rabbi Luther, Rabbi Calvin, and Rabbi Wesley, are as venerable as any of our Rabbims; and their traditions as sacred as those of our Elders

*Editor.*—Does your reading of the Law and the Prophets correspond with our version of them?

*Judah*—Substantially it does; excepting some passages in the Prophets and in the Psalms, and these are not numerous.

*Editor.*—What do you mean by *the Spirit of God?*

*Judah.*—We mean not what you mean. You represent the Spirit as a person distinct from the Father. We believe that Jehovah is one Jehovah; that the Spirit is his power, his wisdom, his goodness in operation; but have no idea of a distinct person or being.

*Editor.*—I have thought that the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is a Christian revelation and not a Jewish, and that some of the criticisms upon *Aleim* and other words and phrases in your writings, applied by our Christian Doctors to this Christian developement, were forced and unnatural.

*Judah.*—They are all so. *Aleim*, with us, denotes one Jehovah. "The Lord our God is one Lord."

*Editor.*—As I merely inquire after your views and customs, permit me to inquire, Do you use bread and wine in eating the Passover?

*Judah.*—There have been from time immemorial a loaf of bread and a flagon of wine upon the same table on which the Passover is served; and both are used by us pretty much as Jesus is said to have used them. We give thanks for them, and distribute them among the family which partake of the lamb. We cannot tell how they came to be used; but our fathers have used them as a thank-offering, and we still hold this among our sacred customs.

*Editor.*—Do you use immersion in water as a religious institution, for any purpose?

*Judah.*—It was used in proselyting a Gentile; but since proselytism has ceased this custom has ceased. When any foreigner was added to the congregation, he was first circumcised, then sprinkled with sacrificial blood, and immersed in a running stream or bath; for we have a tradition that "only by circumcision, sacrifice, and immersion, can a Gentile be received into the congregation:" for it was by circumcision, the blood of sprinkling, and immersion in the Red Sea, or in the cloud and sea, that we were dedicated to the Lord.

*Editor.*—Might I request you to state to me your expectations of the Messiah?

*Judah.*—Our people are now very far from agreed upon this subject. I believe that our nation will all be converted in one day—not to Jesus, however; but that the Messiah will come, and all the people shall know him and receive him cordially when he comes. Then "a nation shall be born in a day." Our people, Mr. Campbell, will never be converted by your missionaries. Those of them who have been said to be converted were hypocrites, and apostatized from us for interest, like your missionaries —— and ——. I agree with Paul in some things; but Paul stole them from the Prophets, and pretended to have been inspired. But it is true that "*all Israel shall be saved*, when the Deliverer shall come out of Zion, and shall turn away impiety from Jacob." Then, too, shall all the Gentiles acknowledge him. And

never will you convert all the Gentiles to Jesus. You can neither convert the Jews nor the Gentiles to your Messiah; but when the Son of David comes all nations shall do him homage.

*Editor.*—Do you know to what tribe you belong?

*Judah.*—No: the family lineage and the tribes are all lost.

*Editor.*—Was it not foretold that the Messiah would be of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of David?

*Judah.*—Certainly it was.

*Editor.*—Was not this foretold for some purpose?

*Judah.*—It was.

*Editor.*—And was it not in order to enable you to recognize and prove the pretensions of the Messiah when he came?

*Judah.*—It was.

*Editor.*—How, then, can these phophecies be of any use to you when the lineage of families and the tribes are lost? The purpose for which they were given cannot now be accomplished, if the Messiah be yet to come!

*Judah.*—I will tell you how I understand this may be accomplished: when the Messiah comes he will tell every man to what tribe and family he belongs.

*Editor.*—But will his assertion of that which you cannot prove but upon his own testimony, be a testimony in his favor! Could such an imposition be detected? Is not this to open the door for imposture? If you cannot prove the family and the tribe of every pretender, the prophecies concerning the family and tribe can serve no purpose whatever.

*Judah.*—Mr. Campbell, we do not want proselytes to our religion. I do not talk with you to convert you. We want no converts. Your Master commanded you to make proselytes; but Moses gave us no such command.

*Editor.*—I admit he did not. I do not expect to convert you to the christian faith; but as you have been so condescending as to answer my questions, I wish, for my own information, to know by what arguments you reject Jesus of Nazareth.

*Judah.*—As a matter of information, but not with a design to convert you, I will continue to answer your questions.

*Editor.*—What was the most heinous offence against God, which your nation, according to the tenor of your covenant, or constitution, could commit?

*Judah.*—There were many very heinous offences which we could, and did commit.

*Editor.*—But was it not treason for your nation, and the most flagrant sin which, under your government, you could be guilty of, to apostatize into idolatry?

*Judah.*—It was. As a *national* sin, it was our greatest sin.

*Editor.*—And was it not a sin to be punished with the utmost severity, as Moses declared?

*Judah.*—Most unquestionably it merited the severest punishment.

*Editor.*—And when your nation, as such, fell into this sin, was not the seventy years captivity in Babylon, together with the destruction of your Temple and city, the punishment inflicted upon you for this sin?

*Judah.*—It was the punishment visited upon us for that sin, and the severest punishment ever inflicted upon our nation for fifteen hundred years.

*Editor.*—But a punishment still more severe has since befallen you; and were we to estimate sin by temporal punishments, we would be constrained to think, that as your Temple was razed to its foundation, your city laid in ruins, and your nation carried captive into all nations, and banished from your own land for almost *two thousand years*, you must have, about that time, committed a sin as much more aggravated in its character than simple idolatry, as the punishment consequent upon it has been more tremendous in its nature, and protracted in its duration, than was the Babylonish captivity with all its concomitants.

*Judah*—We have committed some great sin, it is true: but what that sin was it is not so easy to determine.

*Editor*—But have you not been led to suspect that, as this evil came upon your nation shortly after your rejection and crucifixion of Jesus, that probably it came upon you on that account?

*Judah*—Josephus said it came upon us for the martyrdom of James the Just; but I profess not to know on what account it came upon us.

*Editor*—Did not Moses say, that if you would not obey that prophet of which he informed you, that such a calamity would befal you?

*Judah*—Whom do you think that prophet to have been?

*Editor*—Jesus the Nazarene.

*Judah*—That cannot be; for Jesus of Nazareth was not raised up like Moses: and the prophet of whom Moses spoke was to be raised up as Moses was.

*Editor*—And whom do you say that prophet was?

*Judah*—We believe that Moses was then speaking of Joshua, his successor.

*Editor*—And was Joshua *raised* up like Moses?

*Judah*—He was a *man* like Moses; but you say Jesus was *God.* And he pretended to be equal with Jehovah.

*Editor*—Jesus professed to be *the Son of God;* and sustained his pretensions by works equal, if not superior, to those which certified the mission of Moses. And Jesus was raised up just as Moses was raised, from obscurity, by the mighty power of God. But how can you think that Joshua was regarded in these words of Moses, when he is not named nor alluded to for *ten chapters* afterwards?

*Judah*—What was more natural than for Moses, in the book of Deuteronomy, when he was delivering his valedictory address to our fathers, than to allude to his successor, and to caution the people on the subject of obedience to his successor?

*Editor*—This he does afterwards; but nothing in the context in the 18th chapter of Deuteronomy, will warrant the application of those words to Joshua. Besides, I know not on what authority you could call Joshua a *prophet*. A *prophet like Moses*, Joshua was not; nor, indeed, could any other prophet which God ever sent your people, be at all compared to Moses. So illustrious was Moses, that it was no disparagement to Jesus to be compared to him. For although he far excelled Moses, yet there were more points of coincidence between him and Moses, than between him and any other prophet, Joshua was, as a *leader* to Israel, the successor of Moses: but, pray tell me, in what respect was he like Moses as a *prophet?*

*Judah*—I do not expect you, Mr. Campbell, to agree with me on this subject, and you know I told you that I did not aim at proselyting you to my faith.

*Editor*—True, you said so; but I hope you will indulge me a little farther, as I wish to know what you have to offer against our faith, and what reasons influence you in rejecting Jesus as the Messiah.

*Judah*—We have many, many reasons; more than I could tell you in a long time.

*Editor*—Pray how do you apply the prophecy of Jacob: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from among his descendants till Shiloh come; and to him shall the gathering of the people be."

*Judah*—I do not read that passage as you do. I read it, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah till they come to Shiloh; then shall the people assemble to him"—that is, to *Saul*; for it was at Shiloh the people assembled and made Saul king.

*Editor*—But how will this accord with the fact? Was the sceptre in Judah before it was in the family of Saul? This passage intimates that the sceptre should continue in Judah for a long time; but your reading puts it in the family of Saul before it was in the tribe of Judah: for David was not made king till Saul was rejected.

*Judah*—Judah was prince or chief amongst his brethren, from Jacob's time, till Benjamin, in the person of Saul, became chief; and this fact, together with the place *Shiloh*, where the people assembled to Saul, proves the interpretation.

[Here was a debate about the import of the term *Shiloh*, not remembered.]

*Editor*—But doubtless you must confess that the sceptre did not depart from Judah when Saul was made king: for in the person and family of David it continued almost a thousand years after it departed from Benjamin.

*Judah*—You talk about the peaceable kingdom of the Messiah; I mean, you christians are always preaching about this Prince of Peace. But show me this peaceful kingdom, and I will renounce my opposition to your Messiah.

*Editor*—Here I admit the force of your objection; and candor compels me to say that there is some strength in this objection. I feel my inability to stand up for the modern christian profession. But one fact consoles me, viz. Paul, John, Peter, and Jude assure us that

this state of things would come to pass; therefore it shakes not my faith, for it was foretold. That the Messiah should be a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs; that he should be led as a lamb to the slaughter; and that in his humiliation his condemnation should be extorted, is not more plainly foretold in Isaiah in the 53d chapter of his prophecies, than is the apostacy of christians which we now witness. But this can constitute no objection against the religion, more than that those incidents in the life of the Messiah should be an objection to his divine mission. A reformation has commenced which will never cease till Christians and christianity be what they once were.

*Judah*—You apply Isaiah as other Christians; but I apply it to the Jewish nation—and make the term *he* stand for the nation.

*Editor*—But for this arbitrary appropriation of the term *he* no good reason can be adduced. There is one consideration which I beg you to reflect upon: I will suggest it in the form of a query, and will not farther impose upon your good nature for the present. What proof can any Messiah ever give of his mission, more convincing that did Jesus of Nazareth? Tell me what signs or evidences can your Messiah adduce—only mention *one*, that our Messiah has not afforded?

*Judah*—If all that is testified of Jesus by his historians were true, I would say that the evidence was as satisfactory as necessary. But how will you prove that?

*Editor*—By all the same arguments by which you would impugn their testimony, will I impugn that of your own Moses. But you told me that my argument for the divine mission of Moses was irrefragable. My argument for the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, is just the same.

*Judah*—I read the New Testament more than most of my brethren. I blame you not for your proselyting zeal. Do try and convert your Christians to that book, and teach them to be more just to the poor Jews. I have offered you not my best arguments, but only an *apology* for my unbelief. I respect you as an honest Christian: believe me to be an honest Jew, who cannot believe for the reasons assigned by your Paul in his letter to the Romans. I shall always be glad to see you. But I must wait the conversion of my countrymen: for Israel will all be converted in one day.

*Editor*—One word more. How do you Jews expect to obtain the remission of your sins, as you have neither temple, nor altar, nor priest?

*Judah*—By prayer.

*Editor*—I know of no promise nor institution in your religion which warrants a hope of remission without sacrifice.

*Judah*—Sacrifice we cannot have; for we have neither temple, nor altar, nor priest: and therefore, if God forgives us not through prayer, forgiveness we cannot gain. But our trust is in Jehovah whose mercy endureth forever. Farewell.

EDITOR.

## METAPHYSICAL REGENERATION; *Or, FULLERISM EXPOSED.—No. IV.*

TO-DAY I beguiled the tediousness of the road from Zanesville to New Lancaster, Ohio, by reading Fuller's Strictures on Sandemanianism a second time. I was not a little entertained with many things in this work; and I might add, amused, if one might be amused with a zealous controversy about regeneration between three Doctors, who seemed to agree to differ with one another in a matter in which they are so well agreed that their greatest embarrassment is to explain the difference in their respective systems, or to show that there is a very important difference between them, yet so subtle and minute as to require the greatest labor in words to make it intelligible.

Messrs. Archibald M'Clean, Ecking, Sandeman, and Fuller, are continually figuring in these pages. One while almost agreed in all the cardinal points of faith, repentance, justification, and regeneration, and ever and anon so opposite to one another, that Jews and Samaritans are quite as sociable as they.

Mr. Fuller introduces them into his pages as so many characters in a drama—only with so much ambiguity that the reader cannot conclude till he comes to the last page whether it is to be a comedy or a tragedy; and even then, without taxing his memory, it is not easy to decide whether the whole performance ought to be dedicated to the *comic* or the *tragic* muse. Suffice it to say, that the most knotty point in the volume is to decide whether the physical influence consists in removing blindness or hatred, ignorance or enmity, previous to the impartation of spiritual life. Messrs. M'Clean and Ecking appear to agree that the removal of ignorance, as the cause of unbelief and unregeneracy, or "spiritual illumination," is essentially *previous* to faith. Mr. Fuller will have something more necessary as a previous principle; and between him, Sandeman, M'Clean, Ecking, and Co. the controversy is not about the *necessity*, but the *nature* of this previous change of mind. A *spiritual principle of life*, or a *spiritual principle of light*, superadded to the preached gospel, must, on either hypothesis, be infused or communicated as prerequisite to faith. With Messrs. M'Clean and Sandeman this previous principle of illumination is "the truth passively received." Mr. M'C. says, as quoted by Mr. Fuller, page 126, "It is not pleaded that any truth or sentiment is communicated to the mind by the Spirit, *besides what is already revealed in the word*, and the illumination of the Spirit is to MAKE MEN PERCEIVE AND UNDERSTAND THAT REVELATION WHICH IS ALREADY GIVEN, IN ITS TRUE LIGHT." Mr. Fuller contends for a QUICKENING INFLUENCE which he cannot explain; but such an impartation of life as that communicated to Tabitha by the immediate power of God, which at once makes the mind spiritual, destroys the enmity, and new-creates the soul previous to believing, and *in order* to believing the gospel. "That for which I contend," says he, page 120, "is, that there is a change effected in the soul of a sinner, called in scripture, giving him eyes to see, ears to hear, and a heart to un-

derstand—a new heart and a right spirit—a new creation, &c. &c.—that this change is antecedent to his *actively believing* in Christ for salvation; and that it is not effected by motives addressed to the mind in a way of moral suasion, but by the mighty power of God." In page 133 he represents Mr. M'Clean, his opponent, as essentially agreeing with him, and more fully explains this work of the Spirit upon the regenerated in the words following:—"He (Mr. M'C.) holds with the necessity of a divine supernatural influence being superadded to the word, by which the mind is illuminated and rendered spiritual. But if divine influence consist in any thing distinct from the influence of the word, it must be supernatural and physical. The party is also equally unconscious of it on his principles as on mine: he is conscious of nothing but its effects. He finds himself the subject of new views and sensations; but as to knowing whence they came, it is likely he thinks nothing of it at the time, and is ready to imagine that any person, if he would but look into the Bible, must see what he sees so plainly taught in it. He may be conscious of ideas suggested to him by the word, and of their effect upon his mind; but as to any divine influence accompanying them, he knows nothing of it."

He also introduces President Edwards as teaching that a "NEW SPIRITUAL SENSE" is communicated in regeneration, and defining spiritual understanding in the following words, p. 111: "It consists in *a sense of the heart* of the supreme beauty and sweetness of the holiness, or moral perfection of divine things, together with all that discerning and knowledge of things of religion, that depend upon and flow from such a sense." "Spiritual understanding consists primarily in *a sense of heart* of that spiritual beauty—I say, *a sense of heart;* for it is not speculation merely that is concerned in this kind of understanding."

These extracts fully show Mr. Fuller's views of the physical work upon the heart in order to faith, and prove that, in his view, a person is regenerated or *born again of that which he receives;* than which we cannot conceive a greater outrage upon the use of words, figures, and analogies. The pangs of the new birth, as explained, are transferred to the child. In *nature* the mother travails; but in *grace* these Doctors make the child travail in birth! Paul once said that he travailed in birth in bringing forth his spiritual children; and that though the Corinthians had ten thousand *instructers*, they had not many *fathers;* for he was their only *father, having begotten them by the gospel.* But Paul had respect to the propriety of the analogy and language, and not to the marrow of modern divinity. The regenerated unbeliever, or he that is born again in order to faith, receives the *sixth* sense, or *a sense in the heart*, by which he *perceives* the truth before he believes it.

All these Doctors agree that man is naturally *dead;* but the nature of this death, or rather the cause of it, is not so unanimously agreed upon. A death in trespasses and sins it is said to be; but whether ignorance, carnality, or hatred, as such, is the cause of their spiritual death, is with them an important question: for with them the removal of the cause is the removal of the effect. Removing the ignorance

by supernatural and physical illumination with one; slaying the enmity, or destroying the carnality by the infusion of spiritual life, with another, is the necessary work of regeneration in order to faith. According to the Scriptures, which theorize not upon this subject, some persons are said to be dead in trespasses and sins. To this apply their favorite maxim, "Remove the cause and you remove the effect," and then we approach the Scripture doctrine, as stated in my last essay on this subject. "You who were dead in trespasses and in the uncircumcision of your flesh, he has made alive, *having forgiven you all trespasses.*" Remove the sins and the death in trespasses and sins, as an effect is removed. Hence the Scripture doctrine of regeneration is born of water and of the Spirit, or immersion for the remission of sins—*not in order to faith*, but as a consequence of the belief of the glad tidings of remission. How consonant with the proper use of terms, the nature, and order of things, is the plain, simple style of the New Testament!

Mr. Fuller labors to prove that faith is "a spiritual act" and a "holy act," in order to prove that a man must be spiritual and holy before he can perform such an act. "Believing is a holy exercise of the mind." p. 52. To say, with Mr. Sandeman, that "the holiness of faith is in the truth," Mr. F. repudiates; "because it places the nature of a thing in its cause, and in the object on which it terminates." p. 53. Yet in page 39, he affirms, that "to say that faith includes no holiness, and yet produces it as the seed does the plant, is to contradict the established laws of nature, according to which every seed produces its own body. If holiness, therefore, were not included in faith, it would not grow out of it." Now what is this but affirming that the nature of a thing is in its cause, and in the object on which it terminates? If Celadon love Amelia as his mistress, is not his affection of the same nature with its cause and the object on which it terminates? But this only by the way.

The holiness of faith and its spirituality, as taught by Mr. Fuller, arises from its being "the act of a holy person—of one born of the Spirit." If this were worth a controverting, we might show it to be a gratuitous assertion. Are all the acts of the Spirit of God *spiritual* in Mr. Fuller's sense of the word? If so, matter is spiritual; for the Spirit of God is said to have operated upon it. Are all God's acts holy in his sense of the term? Then was the creating of the fowls, and the fishes, and the reptiles, holy acts. This will convert wisdom, power, and goodness, every attribute and work of God, into one called holiness?

Holiness is a term which appears to be little understood by some of our most erudite teachers. The term *holy* is used, as it etymologically imports, to denote separation from that which is common or unclean. God's presence on Horeb made the mount holy for the time being; and every knife, fork, and spoon belonging to the service of the tabernacle, because separated and not for common use, was *holy*. As disciples are *separated* to the Lord, they are saints or holy persons. But only as *separated*, are they said to be sanctified or holy; for this

the term imports. Holy acts are the acts of persons sanctified or separated to God. To call a person holy, or any of his acts or feelings holy, before he is sanctified through faith and immersion, is as much at war with reason and the meaning of language, as with the plainest affirmations of the Apostles.

But in all the refinements of these religious metaphysicians, one thing seems to have escaped their notice, that there is as great an incongruity in representing their natural mind, or "*natural man*," as being a fit subject of this physical, regenerating, sanctifying energy, as there is, according to their own reasoning and showing, in an unregenerated person believing; or being fitted, without such supernatural aid, to receive the testimony of God. Is NOT GOD'S WORD AS HOLY AS GOD'S POWER, AND GOD'S POWER, ON THEIR REASONING, AS HOLY AS GOD'S WORD? If, then, the natural, and unregenerated, and polluted mind of man is capacitated to receive the transforming impress of the Spirit of Holiness without the intervention of any means, why is it incongruous to suppose it capacitated to receive the testimony of God, or as fit a subject for the *word* as for the *power* of God to operate upon? And may we not ask, Is not God's word as well fitted, and as powerful to create the mind anew, as it was to cause light to shine out of darkness at first? I trust I need not prove that light itself, natural and sensible light, was created by God's word.

But the doctrine of Mr. Fuller is, that independent of the word believed, without the word, and *in order* to enabling a person to believe it, the Spirit of God does impart something he is pleased to call *spiritual life*, by a physical operation, as he made man rational, at first; and until this work is completed, and to effect which, neither argument, nor motive, wish, nor prayer, nor any agency in the power of man, can avail any thing; man is as dead as Lazarus in the grave, as to all power to help himself, to believe, repent, or obey the gospel; and that God withholds this power from some, and imparts it to others according to no other rule or principle than his own secret purpose. This is a capital item in Mr. Fuller's gospel, who yet disguises it all in a parade about the universality of the atonement, while it is as special in its application as this secret decree, physically and supernaturally to impart spiritual life to A, B, and C, which he calls regeneration in order to faith, "strict and literal, and evangelical regeneration," from which D, E, and F are excepted, for no other reason than this same special and secret decree!!! I hope I shall be excused from a farther exposition of this popular doctrine of metaphysical regeneration and its tendencies. EDITOR.

October 30, 1830.

## THE PROTEST AND RESOLUTION OF MAY'S LICK BAPTIST CHURCH.

OUR church being in a state of painful confusion, resulting from attempts by Alexander Campbell and others to produce a reformation in society, as they have been in the habit of calling it—among other things, denying the direct influence of the Spirit till after baptism—contending that persons professing faith in Christ shall be baptized for

the purpose of actually receiving forgiveness of sins—denying, and rather ridiculing, what we call christian experience, in part, at least; namely, a burdened heart on account of sin, and a sensible manifestation of God's pardoning mercy, by faith in the blood of Christ—slandering the Baptist Society, by saying they are in Babylon—against which sentiments, with many others referred to by them, we solemnly protest. Also, against the conduct of the Campbells, Creaths, Smith and others, who, in May, undertook to administer the *supper* in our meeting house—a number of our brethren joining in that thing without the authority of the church—some, likely, without thinking of the wounds and distress they were bringing on their brethren. Our brethren, a number of them, also, have been encouraging preachers to occupy our meeting house, that many of us believe to be Arians, knowing they were trampling on our feelings, which we conceive to be contrary to good order. We have made every effort to place them and us on ground that we can live in some degree of peace, but in vain; and we are now compelled to adopt the following resolution:—

That all of us, whose names are hereunto subscribed, protesting, as above named, against the reformation, (falsely so called,) are willing and determined to rally round the original constitution and covenant of the church, which has never been disannulled—associating therewith the principles of the Union between the Regular and Separate Baptists, [see Articles of Union,] which was adopted by the Elkhorn Association, when this church was a member of that body, and according to which we have acted ever since, which is a fact, as relates to Baptists generally, thereby occupying precisely the same ground we did before the confused and confusing system of things that has destroyed our peace, and the peace of many other churches among us. And that no person shall be considered a member of this church, who will refuse to acknowledge the above, by subscribing their names, or causing them to be subscribed, or who will encourage the above named reformers.

*Remarks by the Christian Messenger.*

This document truly bears the marks of olden times. None but Calvinists, immersed Calvinists, can be members of May's Lick Church; for each member must subscribe the original constitution, which is the Philadelphia Confession of Faith. None can be members of this church who will encourage A. Campbell, the Creaths, Smith, and others, called reformers. Yet Separate Baptists, who oppose Calvinism, may be members, if they will subscribe the above constitution, church covenant, and articles of union; that is, if they will subscribe what they do not believe; or, in plain language, if they will become hypocrites, and not encourage the reformers, by going to hear them, or joining with them in any religious act. If they shall do these things, they may be members of the church. It is well for the religious world that this church has not the keys of the kingdom. All but the few would be hurled out without mercy. It is hoped that this document may be of singular service to the world—to open to their view the evils of human creeds and sectarianism. For this purpose have I consented to give it a place in the Messenger.

# CONCLUSION.

THE retrospect of a volume resembles the retrospective view of our journey through life. We can see objects correctly only at a certain distance. And it happens to short-sighted man that he sees his errors most clearly some time after their commission.—The incidents of a year, and the pages of a volume, when finished and examined by the actor, and the author, seldom appear so perfect as not to require some emendation. The person who makes every day a critic upon the past, will every day improve; and he that subjects his own pages to like impartial criticism, will find ample opportunity to amend either in subject or in style, and most frequently in both.

In reviewing the labors of the last year, both public and private, both oral and manual, methinks if we could live it over again, and act the scenes a second time, many defects would be amended, many errors would be corrected, and many blemishes would be defaced. But, alas! *tempus preteritum nunquam revertitur!*—time past never returns! and what we have done is done, and what we have written is written, and must remain so.

There is an unlimited progression towards perfection in intellectual attainments; and no man can say of his acquisitions in any one department of human sciences, and much less in the knowledge of things divine, that they are incapable of augmentation. If, therefore, a person think he knows any thing perfectly, "he knows nothing as he ought to know." The more we enlarge our horizon, the greater the number and variety of objects which engage our attention; but as the portion of attention bestowed upon each must necessarily become less as the objects become numerous; and as in an extensive landscape the distance of some objects, as well as the number of them, is unpropitious to minute examination, so the more general our information the less perfect our knowledge of things in detail. It is true that the keeper of a Museum may be as intimately acquainted with its contents as the cottager is with the furniture of his cabin; but it is equally true that the apartments of a Museum may be so multiplied, and their contents so enlarged and diversified, as to transcend the capacity of any mind.

Our attention should therefore be most fixed upon the objects most capable of producing real happiness. What those objects are no christian needs to be informed. These are the wares which should fill the magazine of the human soul. Our memory, like a warehouse, has its dimensions. Its capacity may be filled with wares of little worth, or with treasures of immense value. The Jews now generally deal in gold, silver, and precious stones, because they prefer *portable* to *immoveable* possessions. Christians should resemble them in the assortment and acquisition of the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Human science is valuable so far as it qualifies or capacitates the human mind for the comprehension of divine knowledge. Those sciences which have the works of God for their objects, are most

conducive to this high end. Hence the *natural* sciences, rather than those called *moral*, are most deserving of the attention of him who would make the knowledge of God the foundation of rational happiness. Men have made the moral sciences, falsely so called; but God is the author of the natural, inasmuch as he is the Creator of the Universe. He that studies astronomy, geology, chymistry, botany, comparative anatomy, or even geography, if he *study in fact*, studies God. But he that studies ethics, moral philosophy, metaphysics, politics, and mythology, studies not so much *man*, as the *foilies* and *crimes* of man.

The study of nature is the study of God; for nature is a volume of which God is the author. A general knowledge of the solar system, and a particular knowledge of the terraqueous globe with its three kingdoms, (the *animal*, the *vegetable*, and the *mineral*,) is comparatively as propitious to true devotion, as is the occupation of the husbandman compared to that of the merchant and the mechanic. The farmer has more business to transact with God than the merchant or the mechanic; or, to express the same idea in other words, he feels himself more immediately dependent on God than on men, while other professions depend more on man than on God. The husbandman, says James the Apostle, has to exercise continued patience [dependence on God] till he receives the early and the latter rain. Hence we more generally find a larger share of piety and humanity among the same proportion of husbandmen, than among those devoted to merchandize and the mechanic arts. Even a Roman poet represents the virgin Astrea, the divinity who presided over justice, when banished from the cities and the places of rendezvous, as finding no place for a temple among merchants, soldiers, statesmen, artizans, philosophers, orators, poets, priests, &c. found a residence among husbandmen, and made her last abode on earth among them who cultivated the soil.

The venerable fathers of the vtrtuous families of the olden time, were shepherds and husbandmen. But the founders of cities and the inventors of arts, were first found among the descendants of Cain. When Cain *went out from the presence of the Lord* he founded a city, and called it after the name of his son Enoch.

But how easy it is for a textuary to stray from his text, and for me to wander from my subject. I had intended in the conclusion of this volume to say, that, in reviewing it, I see it has its full share of the imperfections of its author; and as I have never passed a single day since I crossed the line of reflection, in which I could not see wherein I might have done something better, or avoided some imperfection; so I have never written a page in which I could not, on re-examination, find something to improve. This I must qualify in regard to the volume now finished. I wish not to be understood as having discovered any serious error in sentiment in the various articles which I have written; but I speak of arrangement, selection, style, and the manner of saying some things, as well as of some of the things said. But all promise is poor dilatory man. I was about to compliment myself

by saying, that, as I have been a severer critic upon myself than my most cordial opponents, I hope still to reform, and to become, if not more perfect, less imperfect, as that great preceptor, *Experience*, may admonish me.

Much of our prospectus remains to be regarded and accomplished. This we have not forgotten nor lost sight of. But our course is somewhat shaped, and must be in some measure, by the enemies of reform. It will still be less so, as the fury of the storm is almost past. Our opponents have nearly exhausted their quiver. All that they can do in many places has been done. But *our* quiver is yet full of arrows, and the panoply of our opposers cannot shield them. Truth is like a two-edged sword, and if in the hand of one disciplined in the military tactics of the Army of the Faith, it is a weapon of irresistible power. Our most, if not our only offensive weapon, is the sword of the Spirit. Our opponents have access to this weapon; but in opposing us they uniformly take hold of the wrong end of the sword; and the event proves that their loss of blood has been greater than ours. *They are now afraid to touch it.*

They rely upon other weapons than those which the christian armory supplies. If they argue it is in a circle. Like Mr. Clopton, our opponents generally prove their doctrine to be true by one another. He invokes the shades of his teachers, the good old *Virginia* Apostles, to prove that what they taught him is true; and to sustain his teachers, he summonses his classmates to prove that his teachers taught the truth. This is a summary, but a fair specimen of the logical course of the van of the Army of Human Tradition. The people prove that their experience is genuine, because all who were the subjects of the same doctrinal operations, feel the same sensations from the same religious impulses. And as they smarted under the same rod, and were healed by the same plaster, they have the same sympathies for each other.

But when this argument fails to carry conviction to the understandings of those who are bold enough to inquire what have the Apostles said, there remains another weapon in their armory on which they repose implicit confidence. This is the old argument of the dark ages revived, formerly called *argumentum baculinum*, or the argument of *tooth and nails*. Physical operations ought to be sustained by physical force. There is a chymical affinity between the doctrine and the proof. Hence these logicians have a notion that the *allegata* and the *probata* should correspond; or, in other words, that the proposition and the proof should be alike physical. Counting hands and noses is, therefore, the order of the day. The truth is detected and error exposed by a lean majority. Thirty heads, black or white, are always supposed to contain more orthodoxy and more intellect than twenty-nine other heads of greater or less dimensions. In the natural sciences the head of a Hervey, a Bacon, or a Newton, did more than balance all the heads in christendom; but in ecclesiastic matters and things, a Negro's pate is equal to Newton's mind, Votes are arguments in Frankfort, and orthodoxy in Georgetown;

and happy is the man who can find *thirteen* votes for any doctrine—for having only *thirteen*, he can carry his opinions in defiance of the TWELVE Apostles!

These are the weapons of the sectarian war. We do not fear the result. The *sword of the Spirit* has once triumphed over all the votes of Judea, Greece, and Rome; and if now unsheathed and wielded by men of the primitive military tactics, the victory is as sure as prophecy, and as certain as the testimony of God. "Greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world."

This year has been delivered of another calf. Soon after its commencement we saw it pregnant with some great events. In August it was in pain to be delivered. Then came forth the Franklin Decrees, and the whole congregation danced before the calf. Aaron was found at Oakley, while Moses was in the Mount. High Priests have had the honor, since Aaron's time, to midwife calves. The sisters found the jewels, the necklaces, and the rings, and Aaron invented the mould. But even in Georgetown, Ky. in the vicinity of which I write these remarks, and notice these signs of the times, the people are tired of dancing to the calf, and Aaron is finding excuses for his mould. Even John Taylor, Sen. has proved that an old man is not always wise, and that a person may survive his own reputation for wisdom and piety, and become a religious suicide. Time, that great innovator and teacher, will enlighten the most dull of apprehension, and wear out the yoke which enslaves human minds to religious tyrants, who make a nod a signal for consciences to bow.

There is not the same necessity for written expositions of the sayings and doings of sectarian leaders. They expose themselves. They furnish not only the *text*, but the *sermon*. We will, therefore, have, we hope, less to do with them, and more time to devote to the redemption of the great principles which are to regenerate the world.

The history of the progress of the Restoration is becoming more interesting, and must receive more attention. But while our eye is fixed upon the great object to be gained—*the illumination and reformation of christians, and the salvation of the world*—we must be governed, in some degree, by the incidents of the times and the course of them who advocate the continuance of the desolating systems of the antichristian kingdom. But the past and the present for the future. We hope ever to be governed by the wisdom which comes from above, which is pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy, and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy.

EDITOR.

*Georgetown, Ky. October* 15, 1830.

☞Many articles intended for this number are necessarily deferred till the next publication; among which are, a communication from *Philalethes*, and an Essay on the Prophecies, both in type. A letter from Bishop *R. B. Semple* has been received, and will probably appear in our next. The List of Receipts shall appear next month [*Print.*]

# THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.
## —EXTRA.—

**BETHANY, VA.**
MONDAY, JULY 5, 1830.


I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## REMISSION OF SINS.

LUTHER said that the doctrine of justification, or forgiveness, was the test of a standing or falling church. If right in this, she could not be very far wrong in any thing else; but if wrong here, it was not easy to suppose her right in any thing. I quote from memory, but this was the idea of that great Reformer. We agree with him in this as well as in many other sentiments. Emerging from the smoke of the great city of mystical Babylon, he saw as clearly and as far into these matters as any person could in such a hazy atmosphere. Many of his views only require to be carried out to their legitimate issue, and we should have the ancient gospel as the result.

The doctrine of remission is the doctrine of salvation; for to talk of salvation without the knowledge of the remission of sins, is to talk without meaning. To give to the Jews "a knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins," was the mission of John the Immerser, as said the Holy Spirit. In this way he prepared a people for the Lord. This doctrine of forgiveness was gradually opened to the people during the ministry of John and Jesus, but was not fully developed until Pentecost, when the secrets of the Reign of Heaven were fully opened to men.

From Abel to the resurrection of Jesus, the just obtained remission at the altar, through priests and sin-offerings; but it was an *imperfect* remission as respected the conscience—a shadowy and unconsolatory remission. "For the law," says Paul, (more perfect in this respect than the preceding economy,) "containing a shadow only of the good things to come, and not even the very image of these things, never could, with the same sacrifices which they offer yearly for ever, make those who come to them perfect. Since being offered, would they not have ceased? because, the worshippers being once cleansed, should have had no longer conscience of sins."

The *good things* to come were future during the reign of Moses and his institution. They have come; and a clear, and full, and perfect

remission of sins, is the great result of the new economy in the consciences of all the citizens of the kingdom of Jesus. The perfection of the conscience of the worshippers of God under Christ, is the grand distinguishing peculiarity in them compared with those under Moses. They have not only clearer views of God, of his love, of his chararter, and of immortality; but they have consciences which the Jewish and Patriarchal Ages could not produce.

If faith only were the means of this superior perfection and enjoyment, and if striking symbols or types were all that were necessary to afford this assurance and experience of pardon, the Jewish people might have been as happy as the Christian people. They had as true testimony, as much faith, and as striking emblems as we can have. Many of them through faith obtained a high reputation, were approved of God, and admired by men for their wonderful achievements.

The difference is in the constitution. They lived under a constitution of *law*—we under a constitution of *favor*. Before the law their privileges were still more circumscribed. Under the government of the Lord Jesus there is an institution for the forgiveness of sins, like which there was no institution since the world began. It was owing to this institution that Christians were so much distinguished at first from the subjects of every former institution.

Our political happiness in these United States is not owing to any other cause than to our political institutions. If we are politically the happiest people in the world, it is because we have the happiest political institutions in the world. So it is in the Christian institution. If Christians were, and may be, the happiest people that ever lived, it is because they live under the most gracious institution ever bestowed on men. The meaning of this institution has been buried under the rubbish of human traditions for hundreds of years. It was lost in the dark ages, and has never been, till now, disinterred. Various efforts have been made, and considerable progress attended them; but since the Grand Apostacy was completed till the present generation, the gospel of Jesus Christ has not been in its original plainness, simplicity, and majesty, laid open to mankind. A vail in reading the New Institution has been on the hearts of Christians, as Paul declares it was upon the hearts of the Jews in reading the Old Institution towards the close of that economy.

To take that vail away, since we have discovered it, has been our constant object. The present essay is intended to develope the Christian Institution for the remission of sins. We cannot promise much for the method we shall pursue, as we have not the means of transcribing this essay, and must put it to press just as it is written, a sheet at a time. But this we may say, being full of this subject, that we shall lay down and prove many propositions in it, which, when viewed in connexion, we hope, will not fail to prove and illustrate the forgiveness of sins through immersion into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, to every proper subject. We apprize the reader that such is our object, that he may examine with the utmost care every single proposition and every proof adduced. We do not wish to take

him by stratagem, to captivate him by guile, nor to decoy him by mere speciosity. *To the law and to the testimony!* How do you read? What say the Scriptures? If they hear not these, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead. We request the reader to examine the following propositions and their proof:—

PROPOSITION I.

*The Apostles taught their disciples, or converts, that their sins were forgiven, and uniformly addressed them as pardoned or justified persons.*

John testifies that the youngest disciples were pardoned, (1 Epistle, ii. 12.) "I write to you little children, because your sins *are forgiven you* on account of his name." The young men strong in the Lord, and the old men steadfast in the Lord, he commends for their attainments: but the *little children*, the youngest converts, he addressed as possessing this blessing as one common to all disciples, "Your sins are forgiven you, *on account of his name.*"

Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, chapters viii. and x. asserts, that one of the provisions of the New Institution is *the remission of the sins of all under it.* "*Their sins* and iniquities I will remember no more." From this he argues as a first principle in the christian economy. "Now," (says he, chapter x. verse 18.) "where remission of these is, no more offering for sin is needed." The reason assigned by the Apostles why *christians* have no *sin offerings* is, because they have obtained remission of sins as a standing provision in the New Institution.

The same Apostle testifies that the Ephesian disciples had obtained remission, chap. iv. 32. "Be to one another kind, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, even as God for Christ's sake *has forgiven you.*" Here, also, in the enumeration of christian privileges and immunities under Christ, he asserts forgiveness of sins as the common lot of all disciples, chap. i. 7. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even *the forgiveness of sins*, according to the riches of his favor." In his letter to the Colossians, chap. i. 14. he uses the same words—"By whom we have *the forgiveness of sins.*"

Figurative expressions are used by the same Apostle, expressive of the same forgiveness common to all christians, 1 Cor. vi. 11. "And such guilty characters were some of you; but *you are washed;* but *you are sanctified;* but *you are justified* by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." Peter, also, is a witness here—1 Epis. i. 22.—"Seeing *you have purified your souls* by obeying the truth through the Spirit."

But there is no need of foreign, or remote, or figurative expressions, when so literally and repeatedly the Apostles assert it as one of the adjuncts of being a disciple of Jesus. Had we no other testimony than that found in a single letter to the Colossians, it would be sufficient to sustain this position. The command given in chapter iii. 13. assumes it as a principle. "*As Christ forgave you, so also do you.*" But in the second chapter, he makes this an inseparable adjunct of being in Christ. "You are *complete* in him—circumcised

—buried with him—raised with him—made alive with him—HAVING FORGIVEN YOU ALL TRESPASSES."

These explicit testimonies from the most illustrious witnesses, sustain my first proposition. On these evidences I rely, and I shall henceforth speak of it as a fact or truth not to be questioned; viz. that all the disciples of Christ converted in the apostolic age, were taught by the Apostles to consider themselves as pardoned persons.

PROPOSITION II.

*The apostolic converts were addressed by their teachers as justified persons.*

We know that none but innocent persons can be legally justified; but it is not in the forensic sense this term is used by the Apostles. Amongst the Jews it imported no more than *pardoned;* and when applied to christians, it denoted that they were acquitted from guilt—discharged from condemnation, and accounted as righteous persons in the sight of God.

Paul in Antioch in Pisidia assured the Jews, that *in* or *by* Jesus all that believed were justified from all things, (certainly here it is equivalent to pardoned from all sins) from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses. The disciples are said to be justified by faith, Rom. v. 1. By favor or grace, Rom. iii. 24. *In* or *by* the blood of Christ, Rom. v. 9. By the name of the Lord Jesus, 1 Cor. vi. 11. By works, James ii. 24. It is God who justifies, Rom. viii. 33.

Christians are said to be justified by God, by Jesus, by favor, by faith, by the blood of Jesus, by the *name* of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God—also by works. Pardon and acquittal are the prominent ideas in every application of the term. God is the justifier. Jesus also, as his Messiah, justifies, and the Spirit declares it. As an act of favor it is done, by *the blood of Jesus* as the rightful and efficient cause—*by faith* as the instrumental cause—by *the name* of Jesus the Lord as the immediate and connecting cause, and by *works* as the demonstrative and conclusive cause. Nothing is more plain from the above testimonies, than that all christians are declared to be justified under the Reign of Jesus Christ.

PROPOSITION. III.

*The ancient christians were addressed by the Apostles as sanctified persons.*

Paul addressed all the disciples in Rome as saints or sanctified persons. In his first letter to the Corinthians, he addressed them all as *the sanctified* under Christ Jesus. "To the congregation of God which is at Corinth, to *the sanctified* under Christ Jesus." Paul argues with the Hebrews that "By the will of God we are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once only. "For by this one offering he has for ever *perfected* (the conscience) of the sanctified." So usual was it for the Apostles to address their disciples as sanctified persons, that occasionally they are thus designated in the inscription upon their epistles. Thus Jude addressing indiscriminately the whole christian community, inscribes his catholic

epistle—"To *the sanctified* by God our Father, and to the preserved (or saved) by Jesus Christ, to the called." "The Sanctifier and the sanctified are all of one family," says the Apostle to the Gentiles. And therefore the sanctifier addressed the sactified as his brethren, and all his brethren the disciples as sanctified. But once more we must hear Paul, and hear him connecting his sanctification with the *name* of the Lord Jesus. He says, (1 Cor. iv. 16.) "But now you are sanctified by *the name* of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God."

PROPOSITION IV.

*The ancient christians, the apostolic converts, were addressed as "reconciled to God."*

Paul repeatedly declares that the disciples were reconciled to God. Rom. v. 10. "When enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." To the Corinthians, (2 Ep. v. 18.) he says, "God has reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ;" and to the Colossians, (i. 21.) he asserts, "It pleased the Father by him to *reconcile* all things to him, having made peace by the blood of his cross; I say, whether they be things on the earth or things in the heavens. Even you [gentiles] who were formerly alienated in mind, and enemies by works which are wicked, *he has now, indeed, reconciled* in the body of his flesh through death." To the Ephesians he declares, that though "once they were without God and without hope in the world, far off, they are now, through the blood of Christ, *made nigh.*" He has made the believing Jews and Gentiles one, that he might, under Christ, *reconcile both in one body to God*, through the cross, having slain the enmity between both thereby. Indeed, he represents God as in Christ, *reconciling a world to himself;* and so all under Christ are frequently said to be reconciled to God through him: which was the point to be proved.

PROPOSITION V.

*The first disciples were considered and addressed by the Apostles, as "adopted into the family of God."*

This adoption is presented by the Apostle as the great reason which called forth the Son of God. "God," (says he, Gal. iv. 6.) "sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might buy off those under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." And because you *are sons*, he has sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, *Abba*, Father." "You are, therefore, now sons of God."

Indeed, the same writer, in his letter to the Ephesians, goes still farther, and represents this adoption of Jews and Gentiles into the rank and dignity of sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, as the great object contemplated in God's predestination. Ep. i. 5. "Having," says he, "predestinated, or beforehand determinately pointed us out, for an *adoption* into the number of children by Jesus Christ, *for himself*, according to the good pleasure of his will." Another testimony must suffice on this point. "Beloved," says the Apostle John, "*now* are we *the sons of God*; and what manner of love has God be-

stowed upon us that we should be called *sons of God!* If sons, then we are heirs of God—joint heirs with Christ."

PROPOSITION VI.

*My sixth proposition is, that the first christians were taught by the inspired teachers to consider themselves as saved persons.*

Because of some ambiguity in the popular import of the term *saved*, when applied to the disciples of Christ, we shall define it as used in this proposition. I need not here descant upon the temporal saviours and temporal salvations which are so conspicuous in sacred history; nor need I mention that Noah and his family were saved from the judgment inflicted upon the Old World; the Israelites from the Egyptians, and from all their enemies—as Paul's companions were saved from the deep, and God's people, in all ages, in common with all mankind, from ten thousand perils to which their persons, their families, and their property have been exposed. It is not the present salvation of our persons from the ills of this life; but it is *the salvation of the soul* from the guilt, pollution, and dominion of sin. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins." It is the salvation of the soul in this present life of which we speak. And here it ought to be clearly and distinctly stated that there is a *present* and a *future* salvation, of which all christians are to be partakers. The former is properly *the salvation of the soul*, and the latter is *the salvation of the body*, or the whole man, at the resurrection of the just. There are few professing christianity, perhaps none, who do not expect a future salvation—the glory or salvation to be revealed in us at the last time. Peter, who uses this expression in the beginning of his first epistle, and who invites the saints to look forward to the salvation yet future, in the same connexion reminds them that they have *now* received the salvation of the soul. Indeed, the salvation of the soul is but the *first fruit* of the Spirit, and but an earnest until the adoption, "the redemption of the body" from the bondage of corruption. It was in this sense of the word that salvation was announced to all who submitted to the Lord Jesus, and hence it is in this connexion equivalent to a deliverance of the soul from the guilt, pollution, and dominion of sin. Having thus defined the present salvation of the soul, I proceed to he proof of my second proposition, viz.—that the first christians were taught by their inspired teachers to consider themselves as *saved persons*.

Peter, on Pentecost, exhorted the Jews to *save themselves* from that untoward generation, by reforming and by being "immersed for the remission of their sins in the name of the Lord Jesus." Luke, in recording the success attendant on Peter's labors, expresses himself thus, verse 42, chapter ii.—"And the Lord added, daily, *the saved* to the congregation." Those who obeyed the gospel were recorded by Luke as "*the saved*." The King's translators supplied out of their own system the words "*should be*." They are not in any copy of the Greek scriptures. Such is the first application of the words "*the saved*" in the Christian Scriptures.

Paul uses the same words in his first letter to the Corinthians, and applies them to all the disciples of Jesus, chap. i. 18. "To the destroyed the doctrine of the cross is foolishness; but to us, *the saved*, it is the power of God." In the same letter, chapter xv. 2. he says of the gospel, "By which *you are saved* if you retain in your memory the word which I announced to you." In his second letter he uses the same style, and distinguishes the disciples by the same designation: "We are through God a fragrant odor of Christ among *the saved*, and among the destroyed." The Ephesians he declares *are saved* through favor; and to Titus he says, "God has *saved* us not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his own mercy"—by what means we shall soon hear Paul affirm. To multiply testimonies, when there is no need of them, is only making a display for its own sake. The above selections are chosen because they are pointed, express, and unequivocal. Premises of salvation to the obedient are to be found in almost every public address pronounced by the Apostles and first preachers. For the Saviour commanded them to assure mankind that every one who believed the gospel, and was immersed, should be saved. And, connecting faith with immersion, Peter averred that immersion *saved* us, purifying the conscience through the resurrection of Jesus.

While christians are taught to expect and hope for a *future* salvation—a salvation from the power of death and the grave—a salvation to be revealed in the last time—they receive the first fruit of the Spirit, the salvation of the soul from guilt, pollution, and the dominion of sin, and come under the dominion of righteousness, peace, and joy. This is what Peter affirms of all the christians in Pontus, Galatia, Capadocia, Asia Minor, and Bithynia, to whom he thus speaks: "Jesus, having not seen, you love; on whom, not now looking, but believing, you rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, receiving the reward of your faith, *the salvation of your souls*."

These six propositions, being each and every one of them, clearly sustained by the unequivocal testimony of God, as adduced, and as is well known to the intelligent disciples, by many more passages, equally plain and forcible, not adduced; we shall now engross them into one leading proposition, which we shall in this essay consider as not to be questioned—as irrefragably proved.

*The converts made to Jesus Christ by the Apostles were taught to consider themselves pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved; and were addressed as pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved persons, by all who first preached the gospel of Christ.*

While this proposition is before us, it may be expedient to remark that all these terms are expressive not of any quality of mind—not of any personal attribute of body, soul, or spirit; but each of them represents, and all of them together represent *a state* or *condition*. But though these terms represent state and not character, there is a relation between state and character, or an influence which state has

upon character, which makes the state of immense importance in a moral and religious point of view.

Indeed, the strongest arguments which the Apostles use with the christians to urge them forward in the cultivation and display of all the moral and religious excellencies of character, are drawn from the meaning and value of the *state* in which they are placed. Because forgiven, they should forgive; because justified, they should live righteously; because sanctified, they should live holy and unblameably; because reconciled to God, they should cultivate peace with all men, and act benevolently towards all; because adopted, they should walk in the dignity and purity of sons of God; because saved, they should abound in thanksgivings, praises, and rejoicings, living soberly, righteously, and godly, looking forward to the blessed hope.

As this essay is designed for readers of the most common capacity and most superficial education, I trust I may be permitted to speak still more plainly upon the difference between *state* and *character*. Childhood is a state; so is manhood. Now a person in the state of childhood may act sometimes like a person in the state of manhood, and those arrived at the state of manhood may in character or behavor resemble those in a state of childhood. A person in the state of a son may have the character of a servant, and a person in the state of a servant may have the character of a son. This is not generally to be expected, though it sometimes happens. Parents and children, masters and servants, husbands and wives, are terms denoting relations or states. To act in accordance with these states or relations, is quite a different thing from being in any of these states. Many persons enter into the state of matrimony, and yet act unworthily of it. This is true of many other states. Enough, we presume, is said to contradistinguish state and character, relations and moral qualities.

It is scarcely necessary to remark here, that, as the disciples of Christ are declared to be in a pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved state, they are the only persons in such a state; and all others are in an unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost state.

*When, then, is a change of state effected, and by what means?* This is the great question soon to be discussed.

We are constrained to admit that a change in any one of these states necessarily implies, because it involves a change in all the others. Every one who is *pardoned* is justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved; and so every one that is *saved* is adopted, reconciled, sanctified, justified, and pardoned.

To illustrate what has already been proved, let us turn to some of the changes of state which take place in society as at present constituted. A female changes her state. She enters into the state of matrimony. So soon as she has surrendered herself to the affectionate government and control of him who has become her husband, she has not only become a wife, but a daughter, a sister, an aunt, a niece,

&c. and may stand in many other relations in which she before stood not. All these are connected with her becoming the wife of a person who stands in many relations. So when a person becomes Christ's, he is a son of Abraham, an heir, a brother, or is pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved.

To be *in* Christ, or *under* Christ, then, is to stand in these new relations to God, angels, and men: and to be out of him, or not under his mediatorship or government, is to be in, or under Adam only. It is to be in what is called "the state of nature," unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, and an alien from the family of God, lost in trespasses and sins.

These things premised, the question presents itself, *When are persons in Christ?* I choose this phrase in accommodation to the familiar style of this day. No person is *in* a house, *in* a ship, *in* a state, *in* a kingdom, but he that has gone or is introduced *into* a house, *into* a ship, *into* a state, *into* a kingdom; so no person is *in* Christ but he who has been introduced *into* Christ. The scripture style is most religiously accurate. We have the words "*in Christ*" and the words "*into Christ*" often repeated in the Christian Scriptures; but in no one place can the one phrase be substituted for the other. Hence in all places, when any person is said to be *in Christ*, it refers not to his conversion, regeneration, or putting on Christ, but to a state of rest or privilege subsequent to conversion, regeneration, or putting on Christ. But the phrase "*into Christ*" is always connected with conversion, regeneration, immersion, or putting on Christ. Before we are justified in Christ, live in Christ, or fall asleep in Christ, we must come, be introduced, or immersed into Christ. *Into* belongs only to verbs implying motion towards; and *in* to verbs implying rest, or motion in. He eats, sleeps, sits in the house. He walks into the field; he rides into the city. "Into Christ" is a phrase only applicable to conversion, immersion, or regeneration, or what is called putting on Christ, translation into his kingdom, or submission to his government.*

*To prevent mistakes I shall here transcribe a part of a note found in the Appendix to the 2d edition of the *new version* of the Christian Scriptures, p. 452:

"I am not desirous of diminishing the difference of meaning between immersing a person *in the name* of the Father, and *into the name* of the Father. They are quite different ideas. But it will be asked, is this a correct translation? To which I answer most undoubtedly it is. For the preposition εις is that used in this place, and not εν. By what *inadvertency* the King's translators gave it *in* instead of *into* in this passage, and elsewhere gave it *into* when speaking of the same ordinance, I presume not to say. But they have been followed by most of the modern translators, and with them they translate it *into* in other places where it occurs, in relation *to this institution*: For example—1 Cor. xii. 13. For by one spirit we are all immersed *into* one body; Rom. vi. 3. Dont you know that so many of you as were immersed *into* Christ, were immersed *into* his death? Gal. iii. 27. As many of you as have been immersed *into Christ*, have put on Christ. Now for the same reason they ought to have rendered the following passages the same way. Acts viii. 16. Only they were immersed *into* the name of the Lord Jesus, xix. 3. *Into* what were you then immersed? When they heard this they were immersed *into* the name of the Lord Jesus. 1 Cor. 1. 13. Were you immersed *into* the name of Paul? Lest any should say, I had immersed *into* my own name. 1 Cor. x. 1. Our Fathers were all

Presuming on the intelligence of our readers, so far as to suppose them assured that this is no mere verbal criticism, but a discrimination that detects one of the pillars of an apostate church, I proceed to another preliminary proposition which I choose to submit in the following words, *to wit:*—

PROPOSITION VII.

*A change of heart, though it necessarily precedes, is in no case equivalent to, and never to be identified with, a change of state.*

In all the relations of this life, in all states or conditions of men, we feel the truth of this; and I would to Heaven that our readers could see as plainly what is of infinitely more importance to them, that no change of heart is equivalent to, or can be substituted for, a change of state! A change of heart is the result of a change of views; and whatever can accomplish a change of views may accomplish a change of heart or feeling, but a change of state always calls for something more.

Lavinia was the servant of Palemon, and once thought him a hard master. She changed her views of him, and her feelings were also changed towards him; still, however, she continued in the state of a handmaid. Palemon offered her first his heart, and then his hand,

---

immersed *into* Moses in the cloud and in the sea. Now in all these places it is *εις*. The contrast between *εις* and *εν* is clearly marked in the last quotation. They were immersed *into* Moses—not *into* the cloud, and *into* the sea, but *in* the cloud, and *in* the sea. To be immersed *into* Moses is one thing, and *in* the sea is another. To be immersed *into* the name of the Father, and *in* the name of the Father, are just as distinct. "*In the name*" is equivolent to *by the authority of.* In the name of the king, or commonwealth, is by the authority of the king or commonwealth. Now the question is, Did the Saviour mean that disciples were to be immersed by the authority of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? If by the authority of the Father, for what purpose were they immersed? The authority by which any action is done is one thing, and the object for which it is done is another. None who can discriminate, can think that it is one and the same thing to be immersed *in* the name of the Lord, and to be immersed *into* the name of the Lord Jesus. The former denotes the authority by which the action is performed—the latter the object for which it is performed. Persons are said to enter *into* matrimony, to enter *into* an alliance, to go *into* debt, to run *into* danger. Now to be immersed *into* the name of the Lord Jesus was a form of speech in ancient usage as familiar and significant as any of the preceding. And when we analize these expressions, we find they all import that the persons are either under the obligations or influence of those things into which they are said to enter, or into which they are introduced. Hence those immersed into one body, were under the influences and obligations of that body. Those immersed into Moses, assumed Moses as their lawgiver, guide, and protector, and risked every thing upon his authority, wisdom, power, and goodness. Those who were immersed into Christ, put him on, or acknowledged his authority and laws, and were governed by his will: and those who were immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, regarded the Father as the fountain of all authority—the Son as the only Saviour—and the Holy Spirit as the only advocate of the truth, and teacher of christianity. Hence such persons as were immersed into the name of the Father, acknowledged him as the only living and true God—Jesus Christ, as his only begotten Son, the Saviour of the world—and the Holy Spirit as the only successful advocate of the truth of christianity upon earth."

and she accepted them. He vowed and she vowed before witnesses, and she became his wife. Then, and not till then, was her state changed. She is no longer a *servant*—she is now a *wife*. A change of views and of feelings led to this change in state; but let it be noted that this might not have issued in a change of state; for Maria, who was another handmaid of Palemon, and changed her views of him and her feelings towards him as much—nay, more than did Lavinia; yet Maria lived and died the servant maid of Palemon and Lavinia.

William Agricola and his brother Thomas, both Canadians, were once much opposed to the constituted government of New England. They both changed their views, and, as a matter of course, their feelings were changed. William became a citizen of Rhode Island; but Thomas, notwithstanding his change of heart, lived and died a colonial subject of a British King.

John and James Superbus became great enemies to each other. They continued irreconciled for many years. At length a change of views brought about a change of heart; but this change for more than a year was concealed in the heart, and by no overt act appeared. They were not reconciled until mutual concessions were made and pledges of a change of feeling were tendered and reciprocated. From enemies they became friends.

A thousand analogies might be adduced, to show that though a change of state often—nay, generally results from a change of feelings, and this from a change of views, yet a change of state does not necessarily follow, and is something quite different from, and cannot be identified with a change of heart. So in religion a man may change his views of Jesus, and his heart may also be changed towards him; but unless a change of state ensues he is still unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost to all christian life and enjoyment. For it has been proved that these terms represent states and not feelings, condition and not character; and that a change of views or of heart, is not a change of state. To change a state is to pass into a new relation, and relation is not sentiment, nor feeling. Some *act*, then, constitutional, by stipulation proposed, sensible, and manifest, must be performed by one or both the parties before such a change can be accomplished. Hence, always, in ancient times, the proclamation of the gospel was accompanied by some instituted act proposed to those who changed their views, by which their state was to be changed, and by which they were to stand in a new relation to Jesus Christ.

This brings us to "*the obedience of faith.*" From the time the proclamation of God's philanthropy was first made there was an act of faith proposed in it by which the believers of the proclamation were put in actual possession of its blessings, and by conformity to which act a change of state ensued.

To perceive what this act of faith is, it must be remarked that where there is no *command* there can be no *obedience*. These are correlate terms. A message or proclamation which has not a command in it, cannot be obeyed. But the gospel can be obeyed or

disobeyed, and therefore in it is a command. Lest any person should hesitate in a matter of such importance, we will prove,

PROPOSITION VIII.

*That the gospel has in it a command, and as such must be obeyed.*

And here I need only ask, Who are they who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord? Paul replies, (Thess. i. 8.) "They who know not God, and *obey not the gospel of his Son.*" To "obey the gospel," and "to become obedient to the faith," were common phrases in the apostolic discourses and writings. Romans i. 5. "By whom we have received apostleship, in order to the *obedience of faith* in all nations, on account of his name." Rom. xvi. 26. "By the commandment of the everlasting God the gospel is made known to all nations for *the obedience of faith.*" Acts vi. 7. "A great company of the priests became obedient to the faith." Rom. x. 8. "But they have not all obeyed the gospel;" and 1 Peter iv. 17. "What shall be the end of them who *obey not the gospel?*" From these sayings it is unquestionably plain, that either the gospel itself, taken as a whole, is a command, or that in it there is a command through the obedience of which salvation is enjoyed.

The obedience of the gospel is called the obedience of faith compared with the obedience of law. Faith in God's promise through Jesus Christ being the principle from which the obedience flows. To present the gospel in the form of a command is an act of favor, because it engages the will and the affections of men, and puts it in their power to have an assurance of their salvation from which they would be necessarily excluded if no such act of obedience was enjoined.

Whatever this act of faith may be, it necessarily becomes the line of discrimination between the two states before described. On this side, and on that, mankind are in quite different states. On the one side they are pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved: on the other they are in a state of condemnation. This act is sometimes called immersion, regeneration, conversion; and that this may appear obvious to all, we shall be at some pains to confirm and illustrate it.

That a relation or a state can be changed by an act, I need scarcely at this time attempt to prove; especially to those who know that the act of marriage, of naturalization, adoption, and of being born, changes the state of the subjects of such acts. But rather than attempt to prove that a state is or may be changed by an act, I should rather ask if any person has heard, knows, or can conceive of a state being changed without some act? This point being conceded to us by all the rational, we presume not to prove. But a question may arise whether *faith* itself, or an act of obedience to some command or institution, is that act by which our state is changed.

PROPOSITION IX.

*That it is not faith, but an act resulting from faith which changes our state, we shall now attempt to prove.*

No relation in which we stand to the material world—no political relation, or relation to society, can be changed by believing, apart from the acts to which that belief, or faith, induces us. Faith never made an American citizen, though it may have been the cause of many thousands migrating to this continent, and ultimately becoming citizens of these United States. Faith never made a man a husband, a father, a son, a brother, a master, a servant, though it may have been essentially necessary to all these relations, as a cause, or principle preparatory, or tending thereunto. Thus, when in scripture, men are said to be justified by faith, or to receive any blessing through faith, it is because faith is the principle of action, and as such, the cause of those acts by which such blessings are enjoyed. But the principle without those acts is nothing, and it is only by the acts which it induces to perform, that it becomes the instrument of any blessings to men.

Many blessings are metonymically ascribed to faith in the sacred writings. We are said to be justified, sanctified, and purified by faith—to walk by faith, and to live by faith, &c. &c. But these sayings, as qualified by the Apostles, mean no more than by believing the truth of God, *we have access* into all these blessings. So that as Paul explains, "by faith *we have access* into the favor in which we stand." These words he uses on two occasions (Rom. v. 2. Eph. iii. 12.) when speaking of the value of this principle, contrasted with the principle of law; and in his letter to the Hebrews, when he brings up his cloud of witnesses to the excellency of this principle, he shows that *by it* the ancients obtained a high reputation—that is, as he explains by their acts of faith in obedience to God's commands.

That faith by itself neither justifies, sanctifies, nor purifies, is admitted by those who oppose immersion for the forgiveness of sins. They all include the idea of the *blood of Christ*. And yet they seem not to perceive, that in objecting to immersion as necessary to forgiveness in connexion with faith, their own arguments preclude them from connecting the blood of Christ with faith. If they admit that faith, apart from the blood of Christ, cannot obtain pardon, they admit all that is necessary to prove them inconsistent with themselves in opposing immersion for the remission of sins; or immersion, as that act by which our state is changed.

PROPOSITION IX.

*But that an act of faith, and not faith itself, changes our state; we prove, not by reasoning analogically, but from the apostolic writings. And to these we shall now attend.* This proposition is, we think, sustained by the following testimonies:—

The Apostle Peter, when first publishing the gospel to the Jews, taught them, that they were not forgiven their sins by faith; but by an act of faith, by a believing immersion into the Lord Jesus. That this may appear evident to all, we shall examine his Pentecostian address, and his Pentecostian hearers.

Peter now holding the keys of the kingdom of Jesus, and speaking under the commission for converting the world, and by the authority

of the Lord Jesus, guided, inspired, and accompanied by the Spirit—may be expected to speak the truth, the whole truth, plainly and intelligibly, to his brethren the Jews. He had that day declared the gospel facts, and proved the resurrection and ascension of Jesus to the conviction of thousands. They believed and repented—believed that Jesus was the Messiah, had died as a sin-offering, was risen from the dead, and crowned Lord of All. Being full of this faith, they inquired of Peter and the other Apostles, *what they ought to do* to obtain remission. They were informed, that though they now believed and repented, they were not pardoned; but must "*reform and be immersed for the remission of sins.*" Immersion for the forgiveness of sins, was *the command* addressed to these believers, to these penitents, in answer to the most earnest question; and by one of the most sincere, candid, and honest speakers ever heard. This act of faith was presented as that act by which a change in their state could be effected; or, in other words, by which alone they could be pardoned. They who "gladly received this word were that day immersed;" or, in other words, that same day were converted, or regenerated, or obeyed the gospel. These expressions in the Apostles' style, when applied to persons coming into the kingdom, denote the same act, as will be perceived from the various passages in the writings of Luke and Paul. This testimony, when the speaker, the occasion, and the congregation are all taken into view, is itself alone sufficient to establish the point in support of which we have adduced it.

But the second discourse, recorded by Luke from the lips of the same Peter, pronounced in Solomon's Portico, is equally pointed, clear, and full in support of this position. After he had explained the miracle which he had wrought in the name of the Lord Jesus, and stated the same gospel facts, he proclaims the same command—"Reform and be converted that your sins may be blotted out;" or, "Reform and turn to God, that so your sins may be blotted out; that seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come, and that he may send Jesus whom the heavens must receive till the accomplishment of all the things which God has foretold," &c. Peter, in substituting other terms in this proclamation, for those used on Pentecost, does not preach a *new* gospel, but the *same* gospel in terms equally strong. He uses the same word in the first part of the command, which he used on Pentecost. Instead of "*be immersed*," he has here "*be converted*," or "*turn to God;*" instead of "*for the remission of your sins*," here it is, "*that your sins may be blotted out;*" and instead of "*you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit*," here it is, "*that seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come.** On Pentecost, it was,

*There is no propriety in the common version of this member of the sentence —*when*, instead of *that*, "seasons of refreshment." Some make modern *revivals* "seasons of refreshment," such as these here alluded to. Then it would read; 'That your sins may be blotted out in the times of revivals'—when revivals shall come! The term is is ὅπως, which, in this construction, as various critics have contended, is equivalent to "*that*" in our tongue. To promise a future remission is no part of the gospel, nor of the apostolic proclamation. All christians experience seasons of refreshment in cordially obeying the gospel.

1. "Reform." 2. "Be immersed." 3. "For the remission of your sins." And 4. "You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." In Solomon's Portico, it was, 1. "Reform." 2. "Be converted." 3. "That your sins may be blotted out." And, 4. "That seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come;" that "you may have righteousness, peace, and joy, in a holy spirit." So read the different clauses in these two discourses to the Jews, expressive of the same acts.

There is yet, in this discourse in the Portico, a very strong expression, declarative of the same gracious connexion between immersion and remission. It is the last period in the discourse. "Unto you, first, brethren of the Jews, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to *bless you*, every one of you, in the act of turning from your iniquities;" or, as we would say, in the act of conversion. Why the Apostle Peter should have used "converted," or "turning to God," instead of "be immersed," is, to the candid and unprejudiced reader of this narrative, very plain. After Pentecost, the disciples immersed on that day, *having turned to God* through Jesus, were spoken of by their brethren as *discipled* or *converted* to Jesus. The unbelieving Jews, soon after Pentecost, knew that the disciples called the immersed, "*converted;*" and immersion being the act of faith which drew the line of demarcation between Christians and Jews, nothing could be more natural than to call the act of immersion the converting of a Jew. The time intervening between these discourses was long enough to introduce and familiarize this style in the metropolis; so that when a Christian said, "*Be converted*," or, "*Turn to God*," every Jew knew, the act of putting on the Messiah to be that intended. After the immersion of some Gentiles into the faith, in the house and neighborhood of Cornelius, it was reported that the Gentiles were converted to God. Thus; Acts xv. 3. the Apostles, in passing through the country, gave great joy to the disciples from among the Jews, "telling them of the conversion" or immersion of the Gentiles. Indeed, in a short time it was a summary way of representing the faith, reformation, and immersion of disciples, by using one word for all. Thus; Acts ix. "All the inhabitants of Sharon and Lydda turned," or "were converted to the Lord."

While on the subject of conversion, we shall adduce, as a fourth testimony, the words of the Lord Jesus to Paul, when he called him. Paul is introduced by Luke in the Acts, telling what the Lord said to him when he received his apostleship. Acts xxvi. 17, 18. "I send you Paul, by the faith that respects me, to open their eyes; to *turn* or *convert* them from darkness to light; and from the power of Satan to God; that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among the saved." Every thing to be accomplished among the Gentiles was to be effected by the faith or truth in Christ. The Saviour connected that, with opening their eyes; their conversion from the ignorance and tyranny of sin and satan; their forgiveness of sins; and finally, an inheritance among the saved or sanctified. First, faith or illumination; then, conversion; then, remission of sins; then, the inheritance. All these testimonies concur with each other in presenting

the act of faith—christian immersion, frequently called *conversion* as that act, inseparably connected with the remission of sins; or that change of state, of which we have already spoken.

One reason why we would arrest the attention of the reader to the substitution of the terms *convert* and *conversion*. for *immerse* and *immersion*, in the apostolic discourses and in the sacred writings, is not so much for the purpose of proving that the forgiveness of sins, or a change of state, is necessarily connected with that act of faith called "christian immersion;" as it is to fix the minds of the biblical students upon a very important fact, viz. that immersion is the converting act; or, that no person is discipled to Christ until he is immersed. It is true, that this view of the matter bears strongly upon the question; but it bears upon other great matters pertaining to the present and ancient order of things.

Discovering that much depended upon having correct views on this point, we have minutely examined all those passages where "conversion," either in the common version, or in the new version, or in the original, occurs, and have found an uniformity in the use of this term, and its compounds and derivatives, which warrant the conclusion, that the converting act is immersion; or that the assumption of the Lord's name is in this Institution. That such was the apostolic import of the term, we have no doubt. No person was said to be converted until he was immersed; and all persons, who were immersed, were said to be converted. If any apostatized, and were again converted, it was in that sense in which our Lord applied the word to Peter, "When you are *converted*, strengthen your brethren;" or, as James used it in his letter when he said, "If any of you err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he who converts a transgressor from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins."

In a number of the Christian Baptist, nigh the close of seventh volume, we noticed, that in the commission to convert the nations, the act by which this work was to be completed, was the act of immersion. This was argued from the charge, as given by the Saviour, from the manner in which the order was ordained: "Going forth," says he, "*disciple* all nations, or *convert* all the nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, teaching the disciples to observe all the things I have commanded you," &c. On this a question was proposed, viz—"Does not the active participle *always*, when connected with the imperative mood, express the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed? Cleanse the room, *washing* it; clean the floor, *sweeping* it; cultivate the field, *ploughing* it; sustain the hungry, *feeding* them; furnish the soldiers, *arming* them; convert the nations *immersing* them—are exactly the same forms of speech. No person will, we presume, controvert this." This has, however, been warmly attacked by several writers. A writer in a New York paper, and *Christianos*, and "*No Theorist*" in the Religious Herald, have warmly opposed this rule. They have only denied that it is *universal*,

That it is a *general* rule, and that the examples given are all fairly under it, no one has, as yet, presumed to controvert. Its *universality* alone has been called in question. It was felt that its generality could not be impugned. To escape from its force, it is necessary to prove it not universal. If, however, it were proved not universal, still its generality might prevent the possibility of escape from its applicability in this case. And what surprizes me not a little is, that brother Andrew Broaddus, the most acute, and discriminating of those who have impugned its universality, does not observe that here it must apply were it only a general and not a universal rule. There is but one position he can take to elude its applicability in this case; and this I am persuaded he will not take. He will not say, that a disciple is finished, and made, or completed, without immersion. That the work of discipling, is finished before immersion and without immersion. Neither Catholics, nor Protestants, will, *as such*, contend that a Pagan or a Jew was ever discipled or converted to the christian faith without immersion. Indeed, I presume, that brother Broaddus has been so much engrossed in discussing the mere universality of the rule, and has been so much engaged in attempting to find exceptions to it, that he has not looked to the bearing, nor to the *cui bono*, the utility, of his examples. That the nations could be converted to Jesus Christ without immersion, he must affirm, if he allege the rule is inapplicable in this place. Will he take this ground? If he do not take this ground, he is only beating the air; or, what is still less profitable, he is sapping and mining that which he has been building up all his life—*that immersion is a discipling institution.* I care not whether he object to those words: it is a fact, a sober fact, that he has, as *a Baptist*, made immersion a discipling institution. I would not say of him what I have to say of many of my opponents, that he would rather go back to Judaism, or Presbyterianism, than that I should convince him of the import of christian immersion. Indeed, they are, in principle, going back to Paidobaptism; and before this controversy is ended they will be driven there, or into the ancient gospel.

"*No Theorist*," whom we suspect to have written much in favor of immersion against Dr. Rice of pamphleteering memory, is well skilled in managing Paidobaptist arguments; yet I will engage to show him, that he must "give up the ship," if he will try me on the affirmative of this position—"*a person may be converted according to the commission without immersion.*" I say, let him take the affirmative of this position, (which he obliges himself to do in attempting to show that my rule is not applicable here) and I will attempt to prove that his argument against Paido-*ism* is, *vox et preterea nihil*, sound and nothing else.

The question is, Who is to be immersed—a christian, a disciple, a convert to Christ; or a believing candidate for discipleship? One who has put on Christ; or one who wishes to put him on? One who is under Christ; or one who wishes to be under him? One in the Kingdom of Jesus Christ; or one who wishes to become a citizen?

This, brethren, is the question. And, although you may not have seen it, in opposing my rule in its application here, you take the Paido-baptist side, and I am the Baptist now.

But, perhaps, he does not oppose the application of the rule in this case; but only wishes to try his strength in critical disquisitions: and thinking that he has got an advantage over me in this case, he and brother Keeling are determined to push me to the wall, and to carry this point by dint of critical investigation. Be it so. I ought not to envy them this pleasure. But I wish them to bear in mind, that in succeeding in this case, their success will be a serious loss to themselves.

But as the question of *conversion*, as well as the *act of converting*, is implicated in this controversy upon the participle, I will, though it may appear tedious, introduce brother Broaddus at his own request, and let him speak to my readers, in reply to my former criticism upon his criticism.

*From the Religious Herald.*

## CRITICISM AGAIN.

*"Disciple or convert the nations, immersing them,"* &c.

THE point at issue between Mr. Campbell and myself, in this case, is not whether baptism appertains to the character of a disciple of Christ: this I not only admit, but maintain. And so of the observance of the Lord's supper, and, indeed, of "all those things" which our King left in charge with his Apostles. Nor is the question between us, whether baptism is the act by which persons are formally recognized as disciples: for here again we agree. But the question is this:—Does it follow from the grammatical construction of the commission, when translated, "convert all the nations, immersing them," &c. that baptism is to be considered as really and properly *the converting act:* is that *by which* the command to *convert* was to be obeyed, and the nations converted? Mr. Campbell *affirms*, and I have undertaken to *deny:* and here we are at issue.

In support of his position, Mr. Campbell argues, that "the *active* participle does *always*, when connected with the imperative mood, express the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed:" and thus, that the commission given by our Lord, "convert all the nations, immersing them," &c. must be interpreted, *convert them by immersing them:* "That was the act (he says) by which the command to convert the nations was to be obeyed." (C. B. vol. 7. p. 164.)

Strongly persuaded that Mr. Campbell was too sanguine in his conclusion, I ventured to call in question the validity of his criticism; and undertook to show, that the universality of his position could not be maintained. That the active participle *does not always* express the manner of performing the preceding command; but that sometimes it expresses another thing, distinct from the first; or, in other words, that it has the force of another imperative mood. This point being established, the argument founded on Mr. Campbell's criticism would fall to the ground; and we must then resort to other *data* to decide the question, "Is baptism really the converting act?" Here,

still I differed from Mr. Campbell, and endeavored briefly to show that conversion does not consist in baptism. This, I believe, is a fair statement of the case.

From the manner in which my friend of the Harbinger has replied to my strictures, (waving his palm triumphantly over me) it would seem that he is quite confident my "Criticism" is blown all to atoms; and possibly some others may think so too. Mr. Campbell can argue, not only *powerfully*, when on the right side; but *plausibly*, when he happens to be on the wrong side. What will be thought when I now say, with confidence, (though I trust, with becoming modesty, and certainly with perfect friendship) that *I feel myself prepared to sustain my criticism, as well as to defend my theology!* ☞The point we have been on has not yet received a proper attention. It is desirable I should not be tedious, and I will enter immediately into the matter.

My position is this: that the active participle, connected with the imperative mood, does not always express the manner in which the preceding command is to be performed:—that sometimes (and more frequently indeed than I had supposed) it expresses a distinct action—having the force of another imperative, and being convertible into that mood, with the conjunction *and*, before it, expressed or understood. Be it observed, that the construction I contend for, takes place in condensed sentences, condensed as to matter and form; there being a close connexion between the parts of the sentence, and an affinity in the object.

I was just about to illustrate my position, *by casting another bullet in the same mould;* thinking it might be smoother than my other two; I was just about to invent another example. But I forbear; there is no need; and I might not only give my friend some trouble, in "converting it into good common English," or in exposing its good-for-nothingness; but bring on myself also some chastisement, for the violence I might happen to commit on the principles of language. Well then; let me exemplify from better authority.

I am called on to bring one example to my purpose, "only one example, from any standard writer, Grecian, Roman, or English;" and I will do more than that: I will perform, for once, a work of supererogation.

Col. iii. 16. "*Let* the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; *teaching* and *admonishing* one another, in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs." Now permit me to say, that these two active participles, *teaching* and *admonishing*, do not strictly and properly speaking, express the manner in which the foregoing injunction or exhortation is to be complied with; but that they express kindred exercises, requisite to be added to the first mentioned qualification: that, therefore, they are virtually distinct imperatives, and capable of being converted into imperative moods; the language, in both cases, being pure and classical. If I am correct, it cannot be denied that I have here brought an example in point. And that I *am* correct, I call to witness the common version and Greek Testa

ment, in both of which the active participles are used; and Dr. Macknight—yes, *Dr. Macknight*, the learned critic and translator, who has actually translated these participles by the imperative mood—rendering them clearly distinct from the first imperative, by introducing the copulative *and*. "*Let* the word of Christ dwell in you richly; *and* with all wisdom *teach* and *admonish* each other," &c. Now Mr. Campbell says, "To convert participles into imperative moods is only necessary when there is some unreasonable point to carry." But Macknight has actually done this: (see Mr. Campbell's New Translation) and I do not suppose Mr. Campbell will accuse *him* of having done this to carry some unreasonable point. Has not my good friend been rather rash and hasty? Most of us are liable to this: may we learn to improve! Here comes another example.

1. Pet. v. 6, 7. "*Humble* yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God that he may exalt you in due time; *casting* all your care upon him; for he careth for you." It is unnecessary to repeat the above remarks, which are apposite and applicable here. Macknight considers the participle as enjoining an additional exercise, and accordingly renders it by the imperative mood. "*Cast* all your anxious care on him." &c. (See New Translation again.)

Other similar examples might be adduced from the Epistles: other "bullets made in the same moulds," namely, in the Greek Testament, in the common version, and in Macknight's translation. But let us now once more try the commission. And here I might, by way of example, take this passage, as it stands in the common version. "*Teach* all nations *baptizing* them:" for scarcely any person, I presume, would insist on a construction of this sort; "teach them by baptizing them." I might take this example, if it were necessary, to keep me in countenance at *least*. However, I will not here insist on it. Let us try Dr. Campbell's translation.

"Go, therefore, convert all the nations, baptizing (or immersing) them," &c. Here it is that we are told, without any hesitation or shadow of doubt, the meaning is, "convert the nations by immersing them:" and that it must be so for this reason, if for no other, namely, that the active participle, connected with the imperative mood, does *always* express the manner of performing that command. Already, however, the force of this criticism appears to be greatly spent. Macknight has withered its strength. Let us see how it will be treated by the illustrious Dr. George Campbell.

In his critical note (mark that! a *critical* note) on this passage, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. he says, "There are manifestly three things which our Lord here distinctly enjoins his Apostles to execute with regard to the nations, to wit, *matheteuein, baptizein, didaskein;* that is, to convert them to the faith—to initiate the converts into the church by baptism—and to instruct the baptized in all the duties of the christian life." Mr. Campbell says expressly, "If *distinct commands*, they ought to be *distinct imperatives*. So will decree all the colleges in christendom." But his namesake the Doctor as positively maintains, that here "there are three things distinctly enjoined,"

that is, virtually, three imperatives, though two expressed in the participial form. So decrees George Campbell, D. D. F. R. S. *Principal of Marischal College*, Aberdeen. Behind his ample Telamonian shield I take shelter.

It is now left to the candid and judicious—or I may say, to the *learned*, (for I too am willing to appeal, in this case, to the learned) to all competent persons it is left to judge, whether I have not produced authority—good standard authority to justify my criticism. And I think I might ask my friend of the "Harbinger" himself, whether it still appears that I was so glaringly wrong in supposing that the phraseology of the commission might well be construed according to that criticism? and whether I ought not to be considered, as in some measure redeemed from the charge of an outrage upon the peace and dignity of the commonwealth of letters?

In the discussion of this point, I have not been led on to oppose the views of my friend Mr. Campbell by an ambitious desire to pluck one laurel-bud from the chaplet which decks his brow, though, indeed, if this were done, he might well afford it. He will have enough left to satisfy any reasonable man. We take pleasure in owning him the conquerer of Walker and M'Calla on Baptism; and the christian public must hail, with gratulation, the complete discomfiture of the atheistic Owen; who, like the *Moloch* of Milton,

> "Down cloven to the waist, with shattered arms,
> And uncouth pain, fled bellowing."

Many admirable things, I own, Mr. Campbell has written; but we know he is not infallible. If my position is now established (as I think it is) "that the active participle, connected with the imperative mood, does sometimes carry the force of an additional injunction," then Mr. Campbell's argument, founded on the grammatical construction of the sentence, must fall of course; and his views must depend on other *data* for support.

Let me now take occasion to say, that on the point in question, there would probably be no material difference between us, were it not that Mr. Campbell, in his zeal for *external* conversion, seems to lose sight of *internal* conversion, or to make it only a thing by the by; or, in other words, that he appears almost to disregard the line of distinction between the visible kingdom of Christ, and the power of that kingdom (or reign) within us. Mark well! I do not wish to *separate*, but to *distinguish* between them. "Convert the nations;" turn their hearts to the Lord: "immersing them;" thus preparing them to enter and enjoy the visible kingdom: "teaching them to observe all things," &c. thus accomplishing them as subjects preparing for the approbation of their King. "We come to Christ by baptism." Yes; but this is not the *only* way. We first come to him *spiritually* by a living faith; and then *externally and visibly* by being "baptized into his death." While I am writing, from my heart I am wishing, that I and all of us, could see satisfactory ground for harmonizing more cordially with one, for whom personally I feel a real friendship;

for whose talents and learning I have the highest respect; and to whose labors I own we are indebted for a noble vindication of the truth in some of its branches. Would that there were not some dangerous blows dealt out, against which I think we ought to be guarded.

The remarks in the above paragraph go, in some measure, towards a defence of my theology. There will not be space for me now to say much in that way. But I cannot forbear expressing my surprize and regret, that Mr. Campbell should so vehemently reprobate my account of *conversion*. In the sincerity of my heart I thought it a good and valid account, and still I think it so. But this, I know, is not enough. Is it scriptural? Clearly so, I think. "Conversion (I said) is a turning of the heart to holiness:" here Mr. Campbell stops me short, without quoting out the sentence, impatient, it would seem, to cast my definition (as an idol) "to the moles and bats." He stops me here, and talks about "mental converts," and "philosophical converts," and how "christian converts are persons whose lives are changed." Well! but hear me out (it is but fair) and see whether this essential requisite is not included. "Conversion is a turning of the heart to holiness, by repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ; this repentance bringeth forth "fruits meet," and this faith "working by love." Now I ask, Is not the necessary change of life embraced here? And what possible fault can be found with this account of conversion, by any person who considers a turning of the heart as well as a change of life to be necessary? And is not a turning of the heart to holiness necessary? Or will God, who requires the heart to be given to him, accept of mere external reformation? Or are our hearts naturally turned already to him? I go for conversion from centre to circumference—from the heart to the life. Ah, my good sir, I am aware indeed that the notions of many people about conversion, need correction; but let us take care, that while we are cutting away the unsound flesh, we cut not the heart.

CHRISTIANOS.

*Caroline, Virginia.*

P. S. Mr. Campbell, it is hoped, will be so obliging as to give this reply a place in the next Harbinger. C.

I am pleased to see that Christianos does not defend the examples which he before alleged. This is candid. And had not Dr. Macknight turned the Greek participles into English imperatives, in the two examples here adduced; I am so charitable as to think they would not have been adduced on this occasion. This is another question involving other canons of criticism. How far a translator may, from the diversity of idioms in any two languages, change the moods and flexions of verbs, to give greater clearness and force of expression, is to be decided before another tribunal, and to be tried in another court, than before that in which we are to try the rights of an English writer to convert imperatives into participles, or particles into imperatives. The remark quoted from my former criticism, and applied with so

much zest to this question of translation, is misplaced: "To convert participles into imperative moods is only necessary when there is some unreasonable point to carry!" If I had said to *translate* participles into imperative moods from one language into another, it would have been apposite; but, surely, the right an English writer has to *convert* participles into imperatives, is another question! I cannot, then, so much admire the candor of my friend Christianos in this instance as in the former; especially as he knew that the Greeks have *three* voices, *five* moods, *eight* tenses, and in each voice they have *eight* participles, and *six* imperatives. If all these are translated into a language with fewer moods, tenses, and participles; changes of moods, tenses, and participles must take place. Supposing these remarks to have no bearing whatever on this question, still they go to show the impropriety of *converting* a canon of writing English into a canon of translating. This remark applies to "*No Theorist*," as fully as to "Christianos." His whole criticism is, however, a mistake of the question; and as it seems he wrote his criticism at the request of somebody, not having read my remarks, as he says; it would be preposterous for me to pay any more attention to them than, to inform him, that he must *read* first, and write afterwards. Then will an apology for attacking, he knows not what, be unnecessary.

Christianos will yet see, I trust, that I have neither been as *rash*, nor as *hasty* as "No Theorist"; nor so rash and hasty as he supposes me to have been, in alleging the universality of this rule in its legitimate interpretation and application. Dr. Macknight translating the participles by imperatives, and supplying an *and* may, or may not be defended, and still the rule be true. Indeed his inserting an *and* shows that he felt that if the participial form was changed, it must either be disconnected from the imperative by *and*, or cut off from it by placing a full period between them, which is a general rule in such cases. His translating a participle by an imperative, required a supplementary *and* according to my rule; but none, according to Christianos.

The reasons which induced Macknight in this case, appear to have been, that the punctuation in some Greek and English copies connected the words "*in all wisdom*," with the command, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly." This is the common version; but he follows the pointing which Griesbach preferred, and reads it, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, *and* in all wisdom teach," &c. To give it greater force, and to mark more distinctly the connexion between "*in all wisdom*" and teaching, he chose this course. It would have been equally plain in rendering it as Thompson has done—"Let the word of the Christ dwell richly in you with all wisdom, when you teach and admonish one another, when with psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs you sing gratefully to the Lord with your heart." Here it is thrown into another mood. Pierce, as learned a critic as any of them, says the phrase, the word of Christ, is "*the discourse concerning the Christ*," and not the ordinary conversation of christians, which is alluded to; and, therefore, it ought to

read, "Let the history of Christ dwell richly among you, teaching," &c.

Having now attended to some of the reasons for the *translation*, let us hear our friend reason upon this his example. He asserts that *teaching and admonishing*, "do not strictly, and properly speaking, express the manner in which the foregoing injunction is to be complied with;" but *not strictly, and improperly speaking, they do! But* "they express *kindred* exercises," german cousins at least; but nothing nearer akin, and "*therefore*" (this is a logical particle after two assertions!) they are "*virtually*" distinct imperatives! This is the reason why they, *improperly* speaking, express the manner of the action! My friend Christianos relied too much upon Dr. Macknight's helping him out, and thought that this would pass for logic, backed as it would be, by the new version.

But I have yet to make my most serious objection to this example; and it is, because it is not a pertinent one. There is more than a simple imperative mood; nay, virtually, two or three imperatives in this sentence. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you," would be a simple imperative. But, "Let it dwell in you *richly*," is another command: and what if teaching and admonishing belong to the *richly*, and not to the simple imperative? Then it, *strictly and properly speaking*, does show the manner in which the word is to dwell in us *richly*. This assertion, without argument, is certainly as conclusive as Christianos' assertion—that it does not strictly and properly express the manner. But I can do more than assert; for the following words show that the *manner* of dwelling in us, is the primary object. "In all wisdom, teaching," &c. The second imperative in this sentence is richly; and according to the common version, the third imperative is "*in all wisdom.*" "*Let the word of Christ dwell in you,*" is one command. "Let it dwell in you *richly*," is a second command. "Let it dwell in you *in all wisdom*," is a third command; and the participles teaching, admonishing, and praising, show *the manner* in which these commands are to be obeyed. I now leave it with the discerning public to say what has become of my friend Christianos' triumphant exception to this *universal* rule.

Having found that this is not *the one example* demanded in my former criticism, I will be excused from considering "the work of supererogation," for the second example falls before the same tribunal.

But it falls before another tribunal also. If separated, as by Macknight, in his punctuation of the sentence, then it is not connected with the imperative *humble*; and so it destroys its being an example at all. And standing before two other imperatives, it may apply to them, or to one of them *in sense*. Suppose then that casting our care upon the Heavenly Father, does not express the manner of humbling ourselves under the mighty hand of God, it may show the manner in which the succeeding imperatives are to be obeyed. This the punctuation must determine. Thompson, into whose version have just now looked, points it as follows—"Having cast all your care

upon him, for he careth for you, be sober, be watchful; because your adversary the devil is walking about," &c. What a pity that my friend Christianos should be so unfortunate in finding examples!

Other critics have suggested to me as exceptions—"Take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, *praying* always with all prayer and supplication." But the *praying* always is the adjunct of the following words—"with all prayer and supplication, praying always"—and this is the manner in which every part of the christian panoply is to be put on.

"Rising be immersed, and wash you from your sins, *calling* on the name of the Lord," is also adduced as an exception by two others. *Calling* here shows the manner in which he is to submit to the commandment. It is in the passive voice, and shows the manner of submitting, not of acting. In this way he is to connect his immersion with invocation of the name of the Lord. Thus, while immersing into the name of the Lord, all the immersed should invoke his name. And thus, in spirit and reality, do all who intelligently go down into the water.

"*Standing*, *going*, and *arising*," precede many imperatives in the septuagint idiom. Because these are modes and manners in which a servant first places himself to receive, or to execute instructions. Standing forward, be immersed; coming forward, wash your hands; arising, enter the synagogue, &c. are all expressions of the same family, and do not constitute exceptions to this rule. Because, even when most rigidly interpreted, they show the manner in which the person is to obey the command, or the manner in which the command is to be obeyed; and both are included in my definition of it.

But my friend Christianos returns to the commission, and after a mere hint of what might be achieved, if the common version could be sustained, ("*teach* all nations," instead of "*convert*") generously, however, giving this up, he throws himself behind the shield of Dr. George Campbell, which places me in as awkward a position as was William Tell, who had to split an apple on the head of his son; either at the hazard of his own life if he shot too high, or at the hazard of his son's if he shot too low. What in such a crisis is to be done? Try to escape, or to die like a soldier! We shall hear what are the conditions proposed. Dr. George Campbell says there are *three* distinct acts in the commission, and yet but *one imperative*; and I have said that if distinct commands, they ought to be distinct imperatives. Am I not stranded here!! I dare not say that Dr. George Campbell is in an error. I dare not retract my position, that if distinct commands they ought to be distinct imperatives. To save myself and the Doctor, is now a consummation most devoutly to be wished. Let us see if any way of escape remains. A says to B, Saddle my horse. This is one imperative. But, in obeying this command, B has to perform three acts—to catch the horse, to bridle the horse, and to saddle him. D says to E make a fire in the study. One imperative again. But how many acts—go after the fuel, carry it to the study, build it upon the hearth, go after a spark, apply it, and fan it into a

flame. One imperative and *six* acts. Well, now, I agree with Dr. George Campbell, that there are three distinct acts. There is first proclaiming the gospel; then immersing the believers; and then teaching the immersed how to behave themselves. But in each of these acts there are diverse acts. In immersing, for instance, there is walking to the bath or river; there is a call for the good confession; there is walking down into the water, taking hold of the candidate, pronouncing the words of the Institution, putting the person under the water, and raising him up again. Here are *seven* acts. But who will say, that there ought to be seven commands? You say so, replies Christianos. I request him to read what I have written again. "If distinct *acts*, they ought to be distinct imperatives." No: that is not what I have written. If distinct *commands*, I say they ought to be distinct imperatives. And so one horn of the dilemma is broken!

In the most perfect good will and esteem for my very intelligent friend and brother Broaddus, I have written the preceding remarks. And I must add, that I feel obliged to him for the unsparing critical severity with which he has examined this rule. I feel, if possible, more confidence in it than before; seeing it pass the ordeal of one who has a hundred eyes for one of some of my opponents, and whose attainments, as a writer, are so conspicuous, and so generally acknowledged and admired as to need neither notice nor encomium.

I think my friend Christianos is quite alarmed at the idea of making baptism the converting act. This is the reason why he sought out exceptions to a rule which he has admitted is *general*, and with what success he has sought for exceptions I leave others to say As I have given all the exceptions to it which I have heard from all quarters, I will now add the opinion of a plain good sense English scholar, who never harangued a congregation. He is from a county bordering on the *cure* of bishop Broaddus.

"Christianos seems to be very tenacious of his views on Rom, viii, and also of his criticism. But, not being able to produce one example similar to his own, he has given two examples quite foreign from the point. He might have given many such examples; but they are no exceptions to the RULE. Because in these examples the participles are used *mentally*, and do not relate to the same word which is governed by the imperative mood as in the commission. In this, and in all similar examples, the participles are used *physically*; that is, to denote an act of the body. To prevent all mistake, I would add to your rule, provided the participle is used *physically*, to denote any act of the body."

I have heard the views of sundry learned persons, who are unanimous in their opinion of its perfect accuracy. But so long as the general accuracy of it is admitted by all, with the commission in all its circumstances, with the practice of the Apostles under it, declarative of the fact, that unless the nations were immersed they were not converted, I see no good reason for contesting, nor need for defending its absolute truth universally. I pray the teachers of the

scriptures to consider, that no person in the scripture style, (and for that we contend) is said to be converted to God until he is immersed. I think I can reconcile, even Christianos to the idea, that the act of immersion is the act of conversion; and what may be called the new birth or regeneration, *spoken of in the Holy Scriptures.* Christianos will agree with me, that many terms have a Bible sense, different from the ecclesiastic sense; and that it is our safety, as it is our province, and our happiness, to understand the Bible language in *the Bible sense*, or to attach the apostolic ideas to the apostolic words.

PROPOSITION X.

*I now proceed to show that immersion and regeneration are two Bible names for the same act, contemplated in two different points of view.*

The term *regeneration* occurs but twice in the common version of the New Testament, and not once in the Old Testament. The first is Matt. xix. 28. "You that have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, you also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Dr. George Campbell, following the punctuation adopted by Griesbach, and substituting the word *renovation* instead of *regeneration*, renders it—"That, at the *renovation*, when the Son of man shall be seated on his glorious throne, you, my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall," &c. *Genesis*, being the term used for *creation*, *palingenesia*, denotes the new creation. Either literally at the resurrection of the dead, or figuratively, at the commencement of the christian era, or at the commencement of the Millennium. Josephus the Jew called the return of Israel to their own land, and institution, "the regeneration," or "palingenesia."

No writer of any note, critic, or expositor, supposes that *regeneration* in Matt. xix. applies to what is, in theology, called the *new birth, or regeneration of the soul*—not even the Presbyterian Matthew Henry, nor Dr. Whitby, Campbell, Macknight, Thompson; nor, indeed, any writer we recollect ever to have read. Regeneration in this passage denotes a state, a new state of things. In the same sense we often use the term. The American Revolution was the regeneration of the country or the government. The commencement of the christian era was a regeneration—so will be the Millennial Era—so will be the creation of the new Heavens and new Earth. As this is so plain a matter, and so generally admitted, we proceed to the second occurrence of this term.

"God has saved us by *the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Spirit." Common version, Titus iii. 5. God has saved us through the *bath of regeneration*, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. This is the second time the word *regeneration* is found in the New Testament; and here it is conceded by the most learned Paidobaptists and Baptists, that it refers to immersion. Though I have been led to this conclusion from my views of the christian religion, yet I neither hold it myself, nor justify it to others on this

account. I choose rather to establish it by other testimonies, than by those who agree with me in the import of this institution. Amongst these I shall place Dr. James Macknight, formerly prolocutor or moderator of the Presbyterian church of Scotland, and translator of the Apostolic Epistles. One of his notes upon Titus iii. 5. is in the following words:—"Through the bath of regeneration." "Through *baptism*, called the bath of regeneration, not because any change in the nature" (but I would say in the *state*) "of the baptized person is produced by baptism; but because it is an emblem of the purification of his soul from sin." He then quotes in proof, (Acts xxii. 16.) "Arise, and be immersed, and wash thee from thy sins." —*Paul*. He supports this view also from Ephesians v. 26. and John iii. 5. "The bath of regeneration," is then, according to this learned Paidobaptist, christian immersion.

Parkhurst, in his Lexicon, upon the word *loutron*, connects this same *phrase*, the washing or bath of regeneration, with Eph. v. 26. and John iii. 5. as alluding to immersion. So say all the critics, one by one, as far as I know. Even Matthew Henry, the good and venerable Presbyterian commentator, concedes this point also, and quotes Eph. v. 26. Acts xxii. 16. and Matt. xxviii. 19. 20. in support of the conclusion, that the *washing of regeneration* refers to baptism.

Our opponents themselves being judges, we have gained this point; viz. that the only time the word *regeneration* occurs in the New Testament, with a reference to a personal change, it means, or is equivalent to, immersion. *Regeneration and immersion are, therefore, two names for the same thing.* Although I might be justified in proceeding to another topic, and in supposing this point to be fully established, I choose rather, for the sake of *the slow to apprehend*, to fortify this conclusion by some other testimonies and arguments.

As regeneration is taught to be equivalent to "*being born again*," and understood to be of the same import with a new birth, we shall examine it under this metaphor. For if immersion be equivalent to regeneration, and regeneration be of the same import with being born again, then being born again, and being immersed are the same thing; for this plain reason, that things which are equal to the same thing, are equal to one another. *All must admit, that no person can be born again of that which he receives.* For as no person is born naturally; so no person can be born again, or born metaphorically, of that which he receives. It destroys the idea, the figure, the allusion, and every thing else which authorizes the application of these words to any change which takes place in man, to suppose that the subject of the new birth, or regeneration, is born again of something which he has received. This single remark shows the impropriety, and inaccuracy of thought; or, perhaps, the want of thought, which the popular notions of regeneration sanction, and sanctify.

In being born naturally there is the begetter, and that which is

begotten. These are not the same. The act of being born is different from that which is born. Now the scriptures carry this figure through every prominent point of coincidence. There is the begetter. "Of his own will he has begotten, or impregnated us;" says James the Apostle. "*By the word of truth*", as the incorruptible seed; or, as Peter says, "We are born again, not from corruptible, but from incorruptible seed, the word of God which endureth forever." But when the act of being born is spoken of, then the water is introduced. Hence, before we come into the kingdom, we are born of water.

The Spirit of God is the begetter, the gospel is the seed; and being thus begotten, and quickened, we are born of the water. A child is alive before it is born, and the act of being born only changes its state, not its life. Just so in the metaphorical birth. Persons are begotten by the Spirit of God, impregnated by the Word, and born of the water.

In one sense a person is born of his father; but not until he is first born of his mother. So in every place where water and the Spirit, or water and the Word, are spoken of; *the water stands first.* Every child is born of its father, when it is born of its mother. Hence the Saviour put the mother first, and the Apostles follow him. No other reason can be assigned for placing the water first. How uniform this style! Jesus says to Nicodemus, "You must be born again, or you cannot discern the Reign of God." *Born again!* What means this? "Nicodemus, unless you are born of water, and of the Spirit, you cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." So Paul speaks to the Ephesians, v. 26.—"He cleansed the church," or the disciples, "by *a bath of water, and the Word.*" And to Titus he says, "He saved the disciples *by the bath* of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit." Now, as soon as, and not before, a disciple, who has been begotten of God, is born of water he is born of God, or of the Spirit. *Regeneration is, therefore, the act of being born.* Hence its connexion always with water. Reader, reflect—what a jargon, what a confusion, have the mystic doctors made of this metaphorical expression, and of this topic of regeneration. To call the receiving of any spirit, or any influence, or energy, or any operation upon the heart of man, regeneration, is an abuse of all speech, as well as a departure from the diction of the Holy Spirit, *who calls nothing personal regeneration, except the act of immersion.*

*Objection* 1.—"You then make every immersed person a child of God, by the very act of immersion; and you represent every person as born of God who is born of water, or immersed."

Provided always, that he has been begotten of God; or, that he has been impregnated by the gospel. If quickened by the Spirit of God before he is buried in the water, he is born of God, whenever he is born of water; just as every other child is born of its father, when born of its mother. But if he do not believe the gospel, or in other words, if he be not quickened by the Word, he is not born of God when he is born of water—he is, to speak after the manner of men, *still born.*

*Objection* 2.—"Then none are born of God, or of the Spirit, unless those who are immersed in water, and raised out of it."

I admit the objection; for he that has never been buried in water, never has been raised out of it. He that has never been in the womb of waters, never has been born of water. Begotten of God he may be; but born of God he cannot be, until born of water. It is worthy of remark, that Dr. Macknight, who certainly had no predilections for this view of the matter, has the word *begotten* in every passage in the first Epistle of John, where the common version has the word *born*, and with the greatest propriety too.

*Objection* 3. —"Then none of the unimmersed can be saved; for none can enter the Kingdom of God, but those born of water."

This is, or is not true, according as you understand the term *saved*. If you understand the term as defined in the preceding pages, they are not saved; for the *present* salvation of the gospel is that salvation into which we enter, when we become citizens of the Kingdom of God. But whether they may enter into the kingdom of future and eternal glory after the resurrection, is a question much like that question long discussed in the schools; viz. Can infants who have been quickened, but who died before they were born, be saved? We may hope the best, but cannot speak with the certainty of knowledge. One thing we know, that it is not a difficult matter for believers to be born of water; and if any of them wilfully neglect, or disdain it, we cannot hope for their future and eternal salvation. But we have no authority to speak comfortably to them who will not submit to the government of the Saviour.

Many persons, I doubt not, who never were informed on these matters, but simply mistook the import and design of the Institution, who were nevertheless honestly disposed to obey, and did obey as far as they were instructed, may, as the devout Jews and Patriarchs who lived before the christian era, be admitted into the Kingdom of future glory. But this by the way, to prevent the calumnies of those who are better disposed to censure every thing we write, than to obey the Lord. I am sure of one thing; because the decree is published: viz. that he that believes the gospel, and is immersed shall be saved; and he who submits not to the government of Jesus Christ shall be condemned.

Some curious criticisms have been offered, to escape the force of the plain declaration of Jesus and his Apostles, upon this subject. Some say, that the words, "Except a man be born of water and Spirit," are not to be understood literally. Surely, then, if to be born of water does not mean to be born of water, to be born of the Spirit, must mean something else than to be born of the Spirit. This is so fanatical and extravagant as to need no other exposure. He who cannot see the propriety of calling immersion a being born again, can see no propriety in any metaphor in common use. A resurrection is a new birth. Jesus is said to be the *first born* from the dead; because the first who rose from the dead to die no more. And, surely, there is no abuse in speech; but the greatest propriety

in saying, that he who has died to sin, and been buried in water, when raised up again out of that element, is born again, or regenerated. If Jesus was born again, when he came out of a sepulchre, surely he is born again who is raised up out of the grave of waters.

Those, who are thus begotten, and born of God, are children of God. It would be a monstrous supposition, that such persons are not freed from their sins. *To be born of God, and born in sin, is inconceivable.* Remission of sins is as certainly granted to "*the born of God*;" as life eternal, and deliverance from corruption, will be granted to the *children of the resurrection*, when born from the grave.

To illustrate what has, we presume to say, been now proved, we shall consider *political regeneration.* Though the term *regeneration* is laxly employed in this association; yet, by such a license of speech, we may illustrate this subject to the apprehension of all. Yes, the whole subject of faith, change of heart, regeneration, and character.

All civilized nations and kingdoms have constitutions; and in their constitutions they have declared who are members of the social compact. Besides those who constitute the community at the time a constitution is adopted, they say who shall compose the community in all time coming; that is, who shall be admitted into it, and by what means they shall become members of it. They have always decreed, that their own posterity shall inherit their political rights and immunities. But they have, also, ordained that foreigners; that is, members of other communities, may become, by adoption, or naturalization, citizens, or fellow members, of the same community. But they have, in their wisdom and benevolence, instituted a rite or form of adoption, which form has much meaning; and which, when submitted to, changes the state of the subject of it. Now, as the Saviour consented to be called a *King*, and to call the community over which he presides, a *Kingdom*, it was because of the analogy between these human institutions and his institution; and for the purpose, not of confounding, but of aiding the human mind in apprehending and comprehending the great object of his mission to the world. And it is worthy of the most emphatic attention, that it was WHEN SPEAKING OF A KINGDOM, HE SPOKE OF BEING BORN AGAIN. Yes; on that occasion, and on that occasion only, when he spoke of *entering into his Kingdom*, did he speak of the necessity of BEING BORN AGAIN. And had he not chosen that figure, he would not have chosen the figure of *a new birth.* With these facts and circumstances before us, let us examine political regeneration as the best conceivable illustration of religious regeneration.

A B was born in the island of Great Britain, a native subject of George III. King of Great Britain. He was much attached to his native island, to the people, the manners and customs of his ancestors and kinsmen. With all these attachments, still increasing, he grew up to manhood. Then he heard the report of this good land, of this large, fertile, and most desirable country. The country, the

people, and the government, were represented to him in the most favorable light. Sometimes these representations were exaggerated; but still he could separate the truth from the fable; and was fully persuaded not only of the existence of these United States, but, also, of the eligibility of being a citizen thereof. He believed the testimony which he heard, resolved to expatriate himself from the land of his nativity, to imperil life and property, putting himself aboard of a ship, and bidding adieu to all the companions of his youth, his kinsmen and dear friends. So full was his conviction, and so strong his faith, that old Neptune and King Eolus, with all their terrors, could not appal him. He sailed from his native shores, and landed on this continent. He was, however, ignorant of many things pertaining to this new country, and government; and on his arrival asked for the rights and immunities of a citizen. He was told, that the civil rights of hospitality to a *stranger* could be extended to him as a *sojourner*; but not one of the rights, or immunites of a *citizen*, could be his, unless he were born again. "*Born again!*" said he, in a disappointed tone, to Columbus, with whom he had his first conversation on the subject. "What do you mean by being born again?"

*Columbus.*—You must be *naturalized*, or adopted as a citizen; or, what we call being *born again.*

*A. B.*—I do not understand you. How can a man be born when he is grown?

*Col.*—That which is born of Great Britain is British, and that which is born of America is American. If, then, you would be an American citizen, you must be born of America.

*A. B.*—"Born of America!" You astonish me! I have come to America, well disposed towards the people and the country. I was once attached to England, but I became attached to the United States; and because of my faith, and attachments, I have come hither; and will you not receive me into your kingdom, because I could not help being born in England?

*Col.*—Well disposed as I am, and we are, to receive you, most assuredly, I say to you, unless you are regenerated in a court-house, and be enfranchised by and before the judges, you can never become a citizen of these United States.

*A. B.*—Yours is an arbitrary and despotic government. What airs of sovereignty you have assumed!

*Col.*—By no means. Right reason, wisdom, policy, and benevolence for you; as well as the safety, dignity, and happiness of the whole community, require that every alien shall be naturalized, or made a citizen, before he exercise, or enjoy the rights of a citizen.

*A. B.*—You are certainly arbitrary—if not in the thing itself, of regeneration—in the place and manner in which it shall be done. Why, for instance, say, that it must be done in a *court-house?*

*Col.*—I will tell you: because there are the *judges*, the *records*, and the *seal* of the government.

*A. B.*—I understand you. Well, tell me, how is a man born again? Tell me plainly and without a figure.

*Col.*—With pleasure. You were born of your mother and of your father, when you were born in England; but you were born *legitimately*, according to the institutions of England. Well, then, you were born *of* England, as well as born *in* it; and were, therefore, wholly English. This was your first birth. But you have expatriated yourself, as your application here proves—I say, *sentimentally* you have expatriated yourself; but we must have a formal, *solemn pledge*, of your renunciation; and we will give you a formal, solemn pledge, of your adoption. You must, *ex animo*, in the presence of the Judges, and the

Recorders, renounce all allegiance to every foreign prince and potentate; and, especially His Majesty the King of Great Britain.

*A. B.*—Is that the thing? I can, with all my heart, renounce all *political* allegiance to every foreign prince and government. Is that all? I have, then, no objection to that.

*Col.*—There is this also:—You are not only to renounce all political allegiance; but you must also, *ex animo,* from the soul, solemnly vow, in the presence of the same Judges and Recorders, that you will adopt, and submit to, the constitution and government of these United States.

*A. B.*—I can do that also. I can renounce, and I can adopt. Nor do I object to the place where it shall be done. But, pray, what solemn pledge will *you give me?*

*Col.*—So soon as you have vowed renunciation, and adoption, in the presence of the Judges and the Recorders; we will give you a certificate, with a *red seal,* the *seal of state,* attached to it; stating that you, having now been naturalized, or born according to our institutions, are born *of* America; and are now a son, an adopted son, of America. And that *red* seal indicates that the blood, the best blood of this government, will be shed for you, to protect you and defend you; and that your life will, when called for, be cheerfully given up for your mother, *of* whom you have been politically born; as it would have been for your own natural political mother, of whom you were first born.

*A. B.*—To this I must subscribe. In my mother tongue it all means, that I give myself up politically to this government, and it gives itself up to me, before witness too. How soon, pray, after this new birth, may I exercise and enjoy all the rights of a citizen?

*Col.*—They are yours the first breath you breathe under your new mother. 'Tis true, we have not, in these United States, any *symbol* through which a person is politically regenerated. We only ask a solemn pledge, and give one. Other nations have symbols. But we understand that the moment the vow is taken, the person is politically born again. And as every other child has all the rights of a child which it can exercise, so soon as it inhales the air; so have all our political children all political rights, so soon as the form of naturalization is consummated. But, remember, *not till then.*

*A. B.*—You say other nations had their symbols. What do you mean by these?

*Col.*—I mean that the naturalized had to submit to some emblematic rite, by which they were symbolically detached from every other people, and introduced among those who adopted them, and whom they adopted. The Indian nations wash all, whom they adopt, in a running stream; and impose this task upon their females. The Jews circumcised and washed all whom they admitted to the rights of their institutions. Other customs and forms have obtained in other nations; but we regard simply the meaning of the thing, and have no symbol.

*A. B.*—In this I feel but little interested. I wish to become a citizen of these United States; especially as I am informed I can have *no* inheritance among you, nor a *voice* in the nation, nor any immunity, unless I am born again.

*Col.*—You must, then, submit to the institution: and I know, that so soon as you are politically born again, you will feel more of the importance and utility of this institution, than you now can; and will be just as anxious as I am, to see others submit to this wise, wholesome, and benevolent institution.

*A. B.*—As my faith brought me to your shores; and as I approve your constitution and government, I will not (now that I understand your institutions) suffer an opportunity to pass. I will direct my course to the place where I can be born again.

I ought here to offer an apology for a phrase occurring frequently in this essay and in this dialogue. When we represent the subject of immersion as active, either in so many words, or impliedly, we so

far depart from that style which comports with the figure of "*being born.*" For all persons are passive in being born. So in immersion, the subject buries not himself, raises not himself; but is buried and raised by another. So that in the act the subject is always passive. And it is of the act alone of which we thus speak.

From all that has been said on *regeneration*, and from the illustration just now adduced, the following conclusions, must, we think, be apparent to all:—

1. Begetting and quickening necessarily precede being born.

2. Being born imparts no new life; but is simply *a change of state*, and introduces into *a new mode of living*.

3. Regeneration, or immersion—the former referring to the import of the act; and the latter term to the act itself—denote only the act of being born.

4. God, or the Spirit of God, being the author of the whole institution, imparting to it its life and efficiency, is the *begetter*, in the fullest sense of that term. Yet, in a subordinate sense, every one, skilful in the word of God, who converts another, may be said to have begotten him whom he enlightens. So Paul says, "I have begotten Onesimus in my bonds:"—and "I have begotten you, Corinthians, through the gospel."

5. The gospel is declared to be *the seed;* the power and strength of the Holy Spirit to impart life.

6. And the great argument, pertinent to our object, in this long examination of conversion and regeneration, is that which we conceive to be the most apparent of all other conclusions, viz.—that remission of sins, or coming into a state of acceptance, being one of the present immunities of the kingdom of heaven, cannot be enjoyed by any person before immersion. As soon can a person be a citizen before he is born, or have the immunities of an American citizen while an alien; as one enjoy the privileges of a son of God before he is born again. For Jesus expressly declares, that he has not given the privilege of sons to any but to those born of God. John i. 12. If, then, the present forgiveness of sins be a privilege, and a right of those under the new constitution, in the kingdom of Jesus; and if being born again, or being born of *water* and of the Spirit, is necessary to admission; and if being born of *water* means *immersion*, as clearly proved by all witnesses; then, remission of sins cannot, in this life, be received or enjoyed previous to immersion. If there be any proposition, regarding any item of the Christian institution, which admits of clearer proof, or fuller illustration than this one, I have yet to learn where it may be found.

But before we dismiss the fifth evidence, which embraces so many items, I beg leave to make a remark or two on the propriety of considering the term "immersion," as equivalent to the term "conversion. And this I do with special reference to the objection of *Christianos*.

"Conversion" is, on all sides, understood to be a turning to God. Not a thinking favorably of God, nor a repenting for former misdeeds;

but an actual turning to God, in word and in deed. It is true, that no person can be said to turn to God, whose mind is not enlightened, and whose heart is not well disposed towards God. All human actions, not resulting from previous thought or determination, are rather the actions of a machine, than the actions of a rational being. "He that comes to God," or turns to him, "must believe that God exists, and that he is a rewarder of every one who diligently seeks him." Then he will seek and find the Lord. An "external conversion" is no conversion at all. A turning to God with the lips, while the heart is far from him, is mere pretence and mockery. But though I never thought any thing else, since I thought upon religion; I understand the "turning to God, taught in the New Institution, to be a coming to the Lord Jesus—not a *thinking* about doing it, nor a *repenting* that we have not done it;—but an *actual coming* to him. The question then is, Where shall we find him? Where shall we meet him? No where on earth, but in his institutions. "Where he records his name," there only can he be found; for there only has he promised to be found. I affirm, then, that the first institution in which we can meet with God, is, the institution for remission. And here it is worthy of notice, that the Apostles, in all their speeches, and replies to interrogatories, never commanded an inquirer to pray, read, or sing, *as preliminary to coming; but always commanded and proclaimed immersion as the first duty, or the first thing to be done, after a belief of the testimony* Hence, neither praying, singing, reading, repenting, sorrowing, resolving, nor waiting to be better, was the converting act. Immersion *alone* was that act of turning to God. Hence, in the commission to convert the nations, the only institution mentioned after proclaiming the gospel, was the immersion of the believers, as the divinely authorized way of carrying out and completing the work. And from the day of Pentecost, to the final *Amen* in the revelation of Jesus Christ, no person was said to be converted, or to turn to God, until he was buried in, and raised up out of the water. I call upon them who dissent, to specify an instance to the contrary.

If it were not to treat this subject as one of doubtful disputation, I would say; that, had there not been some act, such as immersion, agreed on all hands, to be the medium of remission and the act of conversion and regeneration; the Apostles could not, with any regard to truth or consistency, have addressed the disciples as pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved persons. If all this had depended upon some mental change, as faith; they could never have addressed their congregations in any other way than as the moderns do: and that is always in the language of doubt and uncertainty—hoping a little, and fearing much. This mode of address and the modern compared, is proof positive that they viewed the immersed through one medium, and we through another. They taught all the disciples to consider not only themselves as saved persons; but all whom they saw, or knew to be immersed into the Lord Jesus. They saluted every one, on his coming out of the water, as *saved*, and recorded him as such. Luke writes, (Acts ii.) "The Lord added *the saved* daily to the congregation."

Whenever a child is born into a family, it is a brother or a sister to all the other children of the family; and its being born of the same parents, is the act causative and declarative of its fraternity. All is mental and invisible before coming out of the water: and as immersion is the first act commanded, and the first constitutional act; so it was in the commission, *the act* by which the Apostles were commanded to turn, or convert those to God, who believed their testimony. In *this* sense, then, it is the converting act. No man can, scripturally, be said to be converted to God until he is immersed. How ecclesiastics interpret their own language is no concern of ours. We contend for the pure speech, and for the apostolic ideas attached to it.*

To resume the direct testimonies declarative of the remission of sins by immersion, we turn to the Gentiles. Peter was sent to the house of Cornelius to tell him and his family "words by which they might be saved." He tells those words. He was interrupted by the miraculous descent of the Holy Spirit. But it is to be noticed, that the testimony, to which the Holy Spirit there affixed its seal, was the following words:—"To *him* gave all the prophets witness, that every one, who believes on him, *shall receive remission of sins by his name.*" While speaking these words, concerning remission of sins by, or through, his name, the Holy Spirit, in its marvellous gifts of tongues, fell upon them.

Many, seeing so much stress laid upon faith or belief, suppose that all blessings flow from it *immediately*. This is a great mistake. Faith, indeed, is the principle, and the distinguishing principle, of this economy. But it is only the principle of action. Hence, we find the name, or person of Christ always interposed between faith and the cure, mental or corporeal. The woman, who touched the tuft of the mantle of Jesus, had as much faith before as after; but though her faith was the cause of her putting forth her hand, and accompanied it; *she was not cured until the touch.* That great type of Christ, the brazen serpent, cured no Israelite simply by faith. The Israelites, as soon as they were bitten, believed it would cure them. But yet they were not cured as soon as bitten; nor until *they looked* to the serpent. It was one thing to believe, that looking at the serpent would cure them; and another to look at it. It was *the faith*, remotely; but, *immediately, the look*, which cured them. It was not faith in the waters of Jordan that healed the leprosy of Naaman the Syrian. It was immersing himself in it, according to the commandment. It was not faith in the pool of Siloam, that cured the blind man, whose eyes Jesus anointed with clay; it was his washing his eyes in Siloam's water. Hence, the imposition of hands, or a word, or a touch, or the shadow, or something from the persons of those anointed with the Holy Spirit, was the *immediate* cause of all the cures recorded in the New Testament. 'Tis true, also, that

*I must request brother Keeling to publish this my reply to *Christianos*, beginning on page 16, 3d paragraph, and ending here.

without it is impossible to be healed; for in some places Jesus could not work many miracles, because of their unbelief. It is so in all the moral remedies and cures. It is impossible to receive the remission of sins without faith. In this world of means, (however it may be in a world where there are no means) it is as impossible to receive any blessing through faith without the appointed means. *Both are indispensable.* Hence, *the name* of the Lord Jesus is interposed between faith and forgiveness, justification, and sanctification, even where immersion into that *name* is not detailed. It would have been unprecedented in the annals of the world, for the historian always to have recorded all the circumstances of the same institution, on every allusion to it; and it would have been equally so for the Apostles to have mentioned it always in the same words. Thus, in the passage before us, the *name* of the Lord is only mentioned. So in the first letter to the Corinthians, the disciples are represented as saved, as washed, as justified, sanctified *by the name* of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. The frequent interposition of the name of the Lord between faith and forgiveness, justification, sanctification, &c. is explained in a remark in James' speech in Jerusalem, (Acts xv. 17.) It is the application of an ancient prophecy, concerning the conversion of the Gentiles. The Gentiles are spoken of as turning to, or seeking the Lord. But who of them are thus converted? "Even all the Gentiles *upon whom* my name is called." It is, then, to those *upon whom* the name of the Lord is called, that the name of the Lord communicates remission, justification, &c.

Some captious spirits need to be reminded, that as they sometimes find forgiveness, justification, sanctification, &c. ascribed to grace, to the blood of Christ, to the name of the Lord, without an allusion to faith; so we sometimes find faith, and grace, and the blood of Christ without an allusion to water. Now, if they have any reason, or right to say, that faith is understood in the one case; we have the same reason and right to say, that water or immersion is understood in the other. For their argument is, that in sundry places this matter is made plain enough. This is, also, our argument—in sundry places this matter is made plain enough. This single remark cuts off all their objections drawn from the fact, that immersion is not always found in every place where *the name* of the Lord, or *faith* is found connected with forgiveness. Neither is grace, the blood of Christ, nor faith, always mentioned with forgiveness. When they find a passage where remission of sins is mentioned without immersion, it is weak, or unfair, in the extreme, to argue from that, that forgiveness can be enjoyed without immersion. IF THEIR LOGIC BE WORTH ANY THING, IT WILL PROVE, THAT A MAN MAY BE FORGIVEN WITHOUT GRACE, THE BLOOD OF JESUS, AND WITHOUT FAITH: FOR WE CAN FIND PASSAGES, MANY PASSAGES, WHERE REMISSION, OR JUSTIFICATION, SANCTIFICATION, OR SOME SIMILAR TERM OCCURS, AND NO MENTION OF EITHER GRACE, FAITH, OR THE BLOOD OF JESUS.

As this is the pith, the marrow, and fatness of all the logic of our most ingenious opponents on this subject, I wish I could make it

more emphatic, than by printing it in capitals. I know some editors, some of our Doctors of Divinity, some of our most learned declaimers, who make this argument, which we unhesitatingly call a genuine sophism, the alpha and the omega of their speeches against the meaning, and indispensable importance of immersion, or regeneration.

The New Testament would have been a curious book, if, every time *remission of sins* was mentioned, or alluded to, it had been preceded by *grace, faith, the blood of Jesus, immersion*, &c. &c. But now the question comes, which, to the rational, is the emphatic question—WHETHER DO THEY THINK, BELIEVE, TEACH, AND PRACTISE MORE WISELY AND MORE SAFELY; WHO THINK, BELIEVE, AND TEACH, THAT GRACE, FAITH, THE BLOOD OF JESUS, THE NAME OF THE LORD, AND IMMERSION, ARE ALL ESSENTIAL TO IMMEDIATE PARDON AND ACCEPTANCE;—OR THEY WHO SAY, THAT FAITH ONLY, GRACE ONLY, THE BLOOD OF CHRIST ONLY, THE NAME OF THE LORD ONLY—AND IMMERSION, NOT AT ALL? To all men, women, and children, of common sense, this question is submitted.

It is, however, to me admirable, that the remission of sins should be, not merely unequivocally, but so repeatedly declared through *immersion*, as it is in the apostolic writings. And here I would ask the whole thinking community, one by one, whether, if the whole race of men had been assembled on Pentecost, or in Solomon's Portico, and had asked Peter the same question, which the convicted proposed, would he, or would he not, have given them the same answer? Would he not have told the whole race to reform, and be immersed for the remission of their sins? or, to reform and *be converted*, that their sins might be blotted out?—to arise, and be immersed, and wash away their sins? If he would not, let them give a reason; and if they say he would, let them assign a reason why they do not go, and do likewise.

Some have objected against the "seasons of refreshment," or the comforts of the Holy Spirit being placed subsequent to "conversion," or "regeneration," or "immersion;" (for, when we speak scripturally, we must use these terms as all descriptive of the same thing,) because the gifts of the Holy Spirit were poured out upon the Gentiles before immersion. They see not the design of thus welcoming the Gentiles into the Kingdom. They forget the comparison of the Gentiles to a returning prodigal, and his father going out to meet him, even while he was yet a good way off. God had welcomed the first fruits of the Jews into his Kingdom, by a stupendous display of spiritual gifts, called *the baptism of the Holy Spirit*, before any one of the Jews had been immersed into the Lord Jesus. And, as Peter explains this matter in Cornelius' case, it appears that God determined to make no difference between the Jews and Gentiles in receiving them into his Kingdom. Hence, says Peter, "he gave them *the same gift* which he gave to us Jews *at the beginning*," (never since Pentecost.) Thus Peter was authorized to command those Gentiles to be immersed by the authority of the Lord, no man daring to forbid it. But

these gifts of the Holy Spirit, differed exceedingly from the seasons of refreshment, or the righteousness, peace, and joy, in the Holy Spirit, the common enjoyment of all who were immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sins.*

Let it be noted here, as pertinent to our present purpose, that as the Apostle Peter was interrupted by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, when he began to speak of the forgiveness of sins by *the name* of the Lord Jesus; so soon as he saw the Lord had received them. he commanded them to be immersed by the authority of the Lord. And here I must propose another question to the learned, and the unlearned. How comes it to pass, that though once, and only once, it is commanded, that the nations who believe should be immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; and though we read of no person being immersed into this name in this way; I say, how comes it to pass, that all sects use these words without a scruple, and baptize or sprinkle in this name; when more than once persons are commanded to be immersed *for the remission of sins*, and but a few of the proclaimers can be induced to immerse for the remission of sins, though so repeatedly taught and proclaimed by the Apostles? Is one command, unsupported by a single precedent, sufficient to justify this practice of christians; and sundry commands and precedents from the same authority insufficient to authorize, or justify us in immersing for the remission of sins? Answer this who can; I cannot, upon any other principle than, that the tyrant Custom, who gives no account of his doings, has so decreed.

I come now to another of the direct and positive testimonies of the Apostles, showing that immersion for the remission of sins, is an institution of Jesus Christ. It is the address of Ananias to Saul. "Arise and be immersed, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." On this testimony we have not as yet descanted in this essay. It has been mentioned; but not examined.

Paul, like the Pentecostian hearers, when convinced of the truth of the pretensions of the Messiah, asked what *he* should do. He was commanded to go into Damascus, and it should be told him there what to do. It was told him in the words now before us. But say some this cannot be understood literally.

For experiment, then, take it figuratively. Of what was it figurative? of something already received,—of pardon formerly bestowed! a figure of the past! This is anomalous. I read one writer, and but one, who converted this into a *commemorative* baptism, like Israel's commemorating the escape from Egypt, or christians commemorating the Lord's death. And, if I do not mistake, some preacher said it was a figurative expression, similar to "*This is my body!!*" One, whom I pressed out of all these refuges, was candid enough to say he really did not know what it meant; but it could not mean, that Paul was to "be baptized for the remission of his sins."

---

*See Christian Baptist, volume 6, p. 268.*

"To wash away sins" is a figurative expression. Like other metaphoric expressions, it puts the resemblance in place of the proper word. It necessarily means something analogous to what is said. But we are said to be washed from our sins in, or by, the blood of Christ. But even "*washed in blood*" is a figurative expression, and means something analogous to washing in water. Perhaps we may find in another expression a means of reconciling these strong metaphors. Rev. vii. 14. "They have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Here are two things equally incomprehensible —to wash garments *white* in blood, and to *wash away* sins in water! An efficacy is ascribed to water which it does not possess; and, as certainly, an efficacy is ascribed to blood which it does not possess. If blood can *whiten* or cleanse garments, certainly water can *wash away* sins. There is, then, a transferring of the efficacy of blood to water; and a transferring of the efficacy of water to blood. This is a plain solution of the whole matter. God has transferred, in some way, the whitening efficacy, or cleansing power, of water to blood; and the absolving or pardoning power of blood to water. This is done upon the same principle as that of accounting faith for righteousness. What a gracious institution! God has opened a fountain for sin, for moral pollution. He has given it an extension far and wide as sin has spread—far and wide as water flows. Wherever water, faith, and the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are, there will be found the efficacy of the blood of Jesus. Yes; as God first gave the efficacy of water to blood, he has now given the efficacy of blood to water. This, as was said, is figurative; but it is not a figure which misleads, for the meaning is given without a figure; viz. immersion for the remission of sins. And to him that made the washing of clay from the eyes, the washing away of blindness, it is competent to make the immersion of the body in water efficacious to the washing away of sin *from the conscience.*

From the conscience I say; for there its malignity is felt; and it is only in releasing the conscience from guilt, and its consequences,—fear and shame, that we are released from the dominion of sin, or washed from its pollution in this world. Thus immersion, says Peter, *saves* us, not by cleansing the body from its filth, but the conscience from its guilt; yes, immersion saves us by burying us with Christ, raising us with him, and so our consciences are purged from dead works to serve the living God. Hence, our Lord gave so much importance to immersion in giving the commission to convert the world, "*He that believes and is immersed, shall be saved.*"

But, while viewing the water and the blood as made to unite their powers, as certainly as Jesus came by water and blood, we ought to consider another testimony given to this gracious combination of powers, by Paul the Apostle. Heb. x. 24. "Being sprinkled in heart from an evil conscience, and being washed in body with clean water." The application of water, the cleansing element, to the

body, is made in this gracious institution to reach the conscience, as did the blood of sprinkling under the Law.

Some ask, How can water, which penetrates not the skin, reach the conscience? They boast of such an objection, as exhibiting great intellect, and good sense. But little do they think, that in so talking, they laugh at, and mock the whole Divine Economy, under the Old and New Institutions: for, I ask, did not the sacrifices, and Jewish purgations, some way reach the conscience of that people!! If they did not, it was all mere frivolity throughout. And can eating bread, and drinking wine not influence, nor affect, the soul! And cannot *the breath* of one man pierce the heart of another, and so move his blood, as to make his head a fountain of tears! He, who thus objects to water, and the import of immersion, objects to the whole remedial institution, as taught by Moses and by Christ, and insults the wisdom and goodness of God in the whole scheme of salvation. And he, who objects to water, because it can only take away the filth of the flesh, ought rather to object to blood; because it rather besmears and pollutes, than cleanses the body, and cannot touch the soul. But all such reasoners are foolish talkers. To submit to God's institution is our wisdom, and our happiness. The experience of the myriads who were immersed for the remission of their sins, detailed in the christian scriptures, to say nothing of those immersed in our times, is worth more than volumes of arguments from the lips and pens of those who can only regard, and venerate the traditions of their fathers; because it is presumed their fathers were wiser, and more able to judge correctly than their sons.

But as it is not our object to quote, and expatiate upon, all the sacred testimonies, direct and allusive to immersion for the remission of sins, we shall close the proof and illustration of this proposition with an incidental allusion to the cleansing efficacy of this institution, found in the 2d Epistle of Peter, i. 9. After enumerating the additions to faith necessary to securing our calling and election, of which *courage* is the first; and charity, or universal love, the last; the Apostle says, that "he who has not these things is blind, shutting his eyes, and forgetting that he was *purified or purged from his old sins.*" I need not here say that this is, perhaps, (and certainly as far as I know,) universally understood to refer to christian immersion. The "*old sins*," or "*former sins*," can, we presume, mean no other sins than those washed away in immersion. No person has yet attempted to show that these words can import any thing else. It is one of the most unequivocal, and, because incidental, one of the most decisive proofs, that, in Peter's judgment, all former sins were remitted in immersion. With Peter we began our proof of this position, and with Peter we shall end our proof of it. He first proclaimed reformation for the remission of sins; and in his last and farewell letter to the christian communities, he reminds them of that purification from sin, received in, and through immersion; and in the strongest terms cautions them against forgetting that they were so purified.

Were any person to reason upon the simple import of the action commanded by Jesus, I think it might be made apparent from the action itself, in its two parts, *the burial and the resurrection*, that it must import every thing which we have heard the Apostles ascribe to it. Corruption goes down into the grave literally; but does corruption come forth out of it? Is there no change of state in the grave? Who is it that expects to come forth from the grave in the same state in which he descends into it? The first born from the dead did not; nor shall any of them who fall asleep in him. How, then, can it be, that any person, buried with Christ in immersion, can rise with Christ, and not rise in a new state!! Surely the Apostle exhorts to a new life from the change of state effected in immersion. If, indeed, you have *risen* with Christ, set your affections above. Walk in a new life.

Again, and in the last place here, is a child in the same state after, as before its birth? Is not its state changed? And does it not live a new life, compared with its former mode of living? As new born babes desire the milk of the breast, so let the newly regenerate desire the unadulterated milk of the Word, that they may grow thereby. Call immersion, then, a new birth, a regeneration, a burial and resurrection, and its meaning is the same. And when so denominated, it must import that change of state which is imported in putting on Christ, in being pardoned, justified, sanctified, adopted, reconciled, saved, which was the great proposition to be proved and illustrated, and which, we think, has been proved and illustrated by the preceding testimonies and reflections.

Though no article of christian faith, nor item of christian practice, can, legitimately, rest upon any testimony, reasoning, or authority, out of the sacred writings of the Apostles, were it only one day after their decease; yet the views and practices of those who were the contemporaries, or the pupils, of the Apostles and their immediate successors, may be adduced as corroborating evidence of the truths taught, and the practices enjoined, by the Apostles; and, as such, may be cited; still bearing in mind, that where the testimony of the Apostles ends, christian faith necessarily terminates. After this preliminary remark, I proceed to sustain the following proposition:—

PROPOSITION XI.

*All the Apostolical Fathers, as they are called; all the pupils of the Apostles; and all the ecclesiastical writers of note, of the first four christian centuries, whose writings have come down to us; allude to, and speak of, christian immersion, as the "regeneration" and "remission of sins" spoken of in the New Testament.*

This proposition I shall sustain by the testimony of those who have examined all christian antiquity, and by citing the words of those usually called the Apostolic Fathers, and other distinguished writers of the first four hundred years. We shall first summon one whose name is familiar throughout christendom. Whether the writing be genuine or spurious, it is on all hands admitted to be a fragment of the highest antiquity:—

BARNABAS,

In his Catholic Epistle, chapter xi. says, "Let us now inquire whether the Lord took care to manifest any thing beforehand, concerning water and the cross: Now, for the former of these, it is written to the people of Israel, how they shall not receive that baptism which brings to forgiveness of sins; but shall institute another to themselves that cannot. For thus saith the Prophet, "Be astonished, O Heavens! and let the Earth tremble at it; because this people have done two great and wicked things: They have left me, the fountain of living waters, and have digged for themselves broken cisterns that can hold no water. Is my holy mountain, Zion, a desolate wilderness? For she shall be as a young bird when its nest is taken away "—— "Consider how he hath joined both the *cross* and the *water* together. For this he saith, "*Blessed are they, who, putting their trust in the cross, descend into the water;* for they shall have their reward in due time: then, saith he, will I give it them." But as concerning the present time, he saith, "Their leaves shall not fail." Meaning thereby, that every word that shall go out of your mouth, shall, through faith and charity, be to the conversion and hope of many. In like manner does another Prophet speak: "And the land of Jacob was the praise of all the earth;" magnifying thereby the vessels of his Spirit. And what follows? "And there was a river running on the right hand, and beautiful trees grew up by it; and he that shall eat of them shall live for ever." The signification of which is this:—*that we go down into the water, full of sins and pollutions; but come up again bringing forth fruit; having in our hearts the fear and hope which are in Jesus by the Spirit*: "And whosoever shall eat of them shall live for ever." That is, whosoever shall hearken to those that call them, and shall believe, shall live for ever."

## CLEMENT AND HERMAS.

The former gives no testimony on the subject. The latter deposes as follows. [Book of Similitudes, chapter xvi.]—

In speaking of a tower, built upon the water, by which he signified the building of Christ's church, he thus speaks:—"Hear, therefore, why the tower is built on the waters:—Because your life is saved, and shall be saved by water." In answer to the question, "Why did the stones come up into this tower out of the deep?" he says, "It was necessary for them to come up by (or *through*) water, that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God: for before any one *receives the name of the Son of God*, he is liable to death; but when he receives that *seal*, he is delivered from death, and assigned to life. Now that seal is *water*, into which persons go down, liable to death; but come out of it, assigned to life: for which reason to these also was this seal preached; and they made use of it, that they might enter into the kingdom of God."

Both Clement and Hermas wrote about the end of the first, or beginning of the second century.

Hermas, moreover, deposes as follows, in another work of his, called "the Commands of Hermas." [Com. 4. chap. iii.]—

"And I said to him, I have even now heard from certain teachers, that there is no other repentance besides that of *baptism;* when we go down into the water, and *receive the forgiveness of sins*; and after that we should sin no more, but live in purity. And he said to me, *Thou hast been rightly informed.*"

Having closely and repeatedly examined the Epistles of Clement; of Polycarp, to the Philippians; of Ignatius, to the Ephesians; that to the Magnesians; that to the Trallians, the Romans, the Philadelphians, the Smyrnians, and his Epistle to Polycarp; together with the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas, and the genuine works of Hermas, I can affirm that the preceding extracts are the only passages, in all these writings, that speak of immersion.

Having heard the Apostolic Fathers, as they are called, depose to the views of the pupils of the Apostles, down to A. D. 140; I will summon a very learned Paidobaptist antiquarian, who can bring forward every writer and Father, down to the fifth century; and before we hear any of his witnesses, we shall interrogate him concerning his own convictions after he had spent years in rumaging all christian antiquity:—

TESTIMONY OF DR. W. WALL, AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF INFANT BAPTISM.

Pray, Doctor, have you examined all the primitive writers, from the death of John down to the fifth century?

*W. Wall.*—I have.

And will you explicitly avow what was the established and universal view of all christians, public and private, for four hundred years from the nativity of the Messiah, on the import of the saying, (John iii. 5.) "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God?"

*W. Wall.*—"There is not any one christian writer, of any antiquity, in any language, but who understands it of *baptism;* and if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of *water*, any more than born of *wood*."—4th London edition, p. 116, vol. 1. A. D. 1819.

Did all the christians, public and private, and all the christian writers from Barnabas to the times of Pelagius, (410,) as far as you know, continue to use the term *regenerate* as *only* applicable to immersion?

*W. Wall.*—"The christians did, in all ancient times, continue the use of this name, "*regeneration*," for *baptism;* so that they *never* use the word "*regenerate*," or "*born again*," but they mean, or denote by it, *baptism.* And almost all the quotations which I shall bring in this book, shall be instances of it."—vol. 1. p. 24.

Did they not also substitute for "*baptism*" and "*baptize*," the words *renewed, sanctified, sealed, enlightened, initiated,* as well as *regenerated?*

*W. Wall.*—"For *to baptize*, they used the following words:—Most commonly, *anagennan*, to regenerate; sometimes, *kainopoien*, or *anakainizo*, to renew; frequently, *agiazein*, to sanctify. Sometimes they call it *the seal;* and frequently, *illumination*, as it is also called, Heb. vi. 4. and sometimes, *teliosis*, initiation."—vol. 1. p. 8. "St. Austin, not less than a hundred times, expresses *baptized* by the word *sanctified*."—page 194.

We shall now hear some of W. Wall's witnesses; and I choose rather to introduce them from his own pen, as he cannot be supposed partial to the views I have presented in this essay:—

JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin Martyr wrote about forty years after John the Apostle died, and stands most conspicuous among the primitive Fathers. He addressed an apology to the Emperor Antoninus Pius. In this apology he narrates the *practices* of the christians, and the reasons of them.

Concerning those who are persuaded and believe the things which are taught, and who promise to live according to them, he writes—

"Then we bring them to some place where there is water, and they are *regenerated* by the same way of *regeneration* by which we were *regenerated;* for they are washed in water (*en to udati*) in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit: for Christ says, Unless you be regenerated you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven; and every body knows it is impossible for those who are once generated (or born) to enter again into their mother's womb."

"It was foretold by Isaiah, as I said, by what means they who should repent of their sins might escape them; and was written in these words, "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil," &c.

"And we have been taught by the Apostles this reason for this thing. Because we being ignorant of our first birth, were generated by necessity (or course of nature) and have been brought up in ill customs and conversation; that we should not continue children of that necessity and ignorance, but of will (or choice) and knowledge, and should obtain *forgiveness of the sins* in which we have lived, by water (or in the water.) Then is invoked over him that has a mind to be *regenerated,* the name of God the Father, &c. And this washing is called *the enlightening.*"

As you trace the history of infant baptism, Mr. Wall, as nigh the apostolic times as possible, pray why do you quote Justin Martyr, who never mentions it?

*W. Wall.*—"Because his is the most ancient account of *the way of baptizing,* next the scripture; and shows the plain and simple manner of administering it. Because it shows that the christians of those times (many of whom lived in the days of the Apostles) used the word "*regeneration*" (or "*being born again*") for *baptism;* and that they were taught to do so by the Apostles. And because we see by it that they understood John iii. 5. of water baptism; and so did all the writers of these 400 years, NOT ONE MAN EXCEPTED."—p. 54.

Did any of the ancients use the word *matheteuin* (to disciple) as it is used in the commission; or did they call the baptized *discipled?*

*W. Wall.*—"Justin Martyr, in his second apology to Antoninus, uses it. His words are:—"Several persons among us, of 60 and 70 years old, of both sexes, *who were discipled* (*matheteuin*) to Christ, in or from their childhood, do continue uncorrupted."—p 54.

So soon as they began to mysticise they began to teach that immersion *without faith* would obtain remission of sins, and that immersion *without faith* was regeneration. Then came the debates about *original sin:* and so soon as original sin was proved, then came the necessity of infant immersion for the remission of original sin. And so undisputed was the import of baptism for remission, that when the Pelagians denied original sin, pressed with the difficulty, "why immerse those who have no sins?" they were pushed to invent *actual sins* for infants; such as their crying, peevishness, restlessness, &c. on account of which sins they supposed that infants might, with propriety, be immersed, though they had no original sin.

## TERTULLIAN.

Tertullian, the first who mentions infant baptism, flourished about A. D. 216. He writes against the practice: and among his most

conclusive arguments against infant immersion, (for then there was no sprinkling,) he assumes, as a fundamental principle not to be questioned, that immersion was for the remission of sins; and this being universally conceded, he argues as follows:—

"Our Lord says, indeed, "Do not forbid them to come to me;" therefore let them come when they are grown up—let them come when they understand—when they are instructed whither it is that they come. Let them be made christians when they can know Christ. What need their *guiltless* age make such haste to *the forgiveness of sins?* Men will proceed more warily in worldly goods; and he that should not have earthly goods committed to him, yet shall have heavenly! Let them know how to desire this salvation, that you may appear to have given to one that asketh."—p. 74.

ORIGEN.

Origen, though so great a visionary, is, nevertheless, a competent witness in any question of fact. And here I would again remind the reader, that it is as witnesses in a question of *fact*, and not of *opinion*, we summon these ancients. It is not to tell their own opinions, nor the reasons of them; but to depose what were the views of christians on this institution in their times. There was no controversy on this subject for more than four hundred years, and therefore we expect only to find incidental allusions to it; but these are numerous, and of the most unquestionable character. Origen, in his homily upon Luke, says:—

"Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of their sins. Of what sins? Or when have they sinned? Or how can any reason of the law, in their case, hold good, but according to that sense that we mentioned even now? (that is) none is free from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day upon the earth."

And in another place he says, that

"The baptism of the church is given for the forgiveness of sins."

And again—

"If there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them."

In another place he says—

"But in the *regeneration*, (or new birth,) by the *laver*, (or baptism,) every one that is born again of water and the Spirit, is clear from pollution: clear (as I may venture to say) as by a glass darkly.—p. 82.

But now let me ask Dr. Wall—Do Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and St. Austin, concur with all their predecessors in those views of regeneration and remission?

*W. Wall.*—Yes, exactly. "I have observed, among the several names which the ancients give to *baptism*, they often, by this phrase, *"the forgiveness of sins,"* do mean the sacrament of baptism."—p. 179. "And as for Chrysostom, he expressly says, "In baptism, or the spiritual circumcision, there is no trouble to be undergone but to throw off the load of sins, and receive pardon for all foregoing offences."—p. 182. And again; "There is no receiving or having the bequeathed inheritance before one is baptized; and none can be called *a son* till he is baptized."—p. 183.

The controversy about infant baptism and original sin were contemporaneous; and just so soon as they decided the nature and extent of original sin, baptism for the remission of sins was given to infants

because of this pollution, and defended because of the necessity of regeneration and forgiveness to salvation; and because immersion was universally admitted to be the scriptural regeneration and remission. In this way, there is no reasonable doubt, but infant baptism began; and for convenience sake, as Dr. Wall contends, it was substituted by infant sprinkling.

Unless we were to transcribe all the testimonies of antiquity, one by one, no greater assurance can be given, that, for more than four hundred years after Christ, all writers, orthodox and heterodox, Pelagius and Austin not excepted, concurred in the preceding views. Were I to summon others—Eusebius, Dupin, Lightfoot, and Hammond, *cum multis aliis*—will depose the same.

This proposition we will dismiss with the testimony of the most renowned of the Bishops of Africa. I extract it from a work now generally read, called the "History of the Martyrs." It is from the account Cyprian gives of his conversion.—p. 317.

CYPRIAN.

"While (says he) I laid in darkness and uncertainty, I thought on what I had heard of a second birth, proposed by the divine goodness; but could not comprehend how a man could receive a new life from his being immersed in water; cease to be what he was before, and still remain the same body. How, said I, can such a change be possible? How can he, who is grown old in a worldly way of living, strip himself of his former inclinations, and inveterate habits? Can he, who has spent his whole time in plenty, and indulged his appetite without restraint, ever be transformed into an example of frugality and sobriety? Or he who has always appeared in splendid apparel, stoop to the plain, simple, and unornamented dress of the common people? It is impossible for a man, who has borne the most honorable posts, ever to submit to lead a private and an obscure life: or that he who was never seen in public without a crowd of attendants, and persons who endeavored to make their fortunes by attending him, should ever bear to be alone. This (continues he) was my way of arguing; I thought it was impossible for me to leave my former course of life, and the habits I was then engaged in, and accustomed to: but no sooner did the life-giving water wash the spots off my soul, than my heart received the heavenly light of the Holy Spirit, which transformed me into a new creature; all my difficulties were cleared, my doubts dissolved, and my darkness dispelled. I was then able to do what before seemed impossible; could discern that my former life was earthly and sinful, according to the impurity of my birth; but that my spiritual birth gave me new ideas and inclinations, and directed all my views to God."

Cyprian flourished A. D. 250.

PROPOSITION XII.

*But even the reformed creeds, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist, substantially avow the same views of immersion, though apparently afraid to carry them out in faith and practice.*

This proposition will be sustained by an extract from the creed of each of these sects.

EPISCOPALIAN.

The clergy are ordered, before proceeding to baptize, to make the following prayer.—Common Prayer, p. 165.

"Almighty and everlasting God, who, of thy great mercy, didst save Noah and his family in the Ark from perishing by water; and also didst safely lead

the children of Israel thy people through the Red Sea; figuring thereby thy holy Baptism; and by the Baptism of thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, didst sanctify the element of water, to the mystical washing away of sin; we beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt mercifully look upon *these* thy *servants;* wash *them* and sanctify *them* with the Holy Ghost; that *they*, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the Ark of Christ's Church; and being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally *they* may come to the land of everlasting life; there to reign with thee, world without end, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

After reading a part of the discourse with Nicodemus, they are ordered to make the following exhortation.— p. 165.—

"Beloved, ye hear in this gospel the express words of our Saviour Christ, that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament, where it may be had. Likewise, immediately before his ascension into heaven, (as we read in the last chapter of St. Mark's Gospel,) he gave command to his disciples, saying, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. Which also showeth unto us the great benefit we reap thereby. For which cause St. Peter the Apostle, when upon his first preaching of the gospel many were pricked at the heart, and said to him and the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? replied, and said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: for the promise is to you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words exhorted he them, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation. For, as the same Apostle testifieth in another place, even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe that he will favorably receive *these* present *persons*, truly repenting, and coming unto him by faith; that he will grant *them* remission of *their* sins, and bestow upon *them* the Holy Ghost; that he will give *them* the blessing of eternal life, and make *them partakers* of his everlasting kingdom."

This, I need not add, is in accordance with the sentiments advanced in this essay. What a pity that the Episcopal Church does not believe and practise her own creed!

## PRESBYTERIAN.

The Presbyterian Confession, on Baptism, chap. xxviii. sect. 1, declares that—

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized in the visible church; but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his engrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life: which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world."

"*A sign and seal of remission of sins!!*" This is much nigher the truth than this church seems to be apprized of. However, she cannot believe her own creed; for she does not believe that baptism is a sign and a seal of remission of sins, nor of regeneration, in her own sense of it, to her baptized or sprinkled infants. But in paying any regard to the Scriptures, she could not say less than she has said. It is no wonder that many sectaries cannot be persuaded to think that the Scriptures mean what they say; for they are so much accustom-

ed to say what they do not mean, that they cannot think God does mean what he says.

## METHODIST.

The Methodist Creed says—

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, (and that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and they that are in the flesh cannot please God, but live in sin, committing many actual transgressions:) and that our Saviour Christ saith, None shall enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost; I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous goodness he will grant to *these persons*, that which by nature *they* cannot have; that *they* may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and be made lively *members* of the same."

Then it is ordained that the minister say, or repeat the following prayer:—

"Almighty and immortal God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to thee for succor, the life of them that believe, and the resurrection of the dead: We call upon thee for *these persons;* that *they* coming to thy holy baptism, may receive remission of *their sins*, by spiritual regeneration. Receive *them*, O Lord, as thou hast promised by thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you: so give unto us that ask; let us that seek, find; open the gate unto us that knock; that *these persons* may enjoy the everlasting benediction of the heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which thou hast promised by Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"—*Dis. p.* 105.

Thus the Methodist Creed and Church are nearly as scriptural as the church from which they sprang. She prays for those to be baptized, that in baptism they may receive remission of sins! Does she believe what she says?

## BAPTIST.

*Chapter* xxx. *Section* 1.

"Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with him in his death and resurrection; of his being engrafted into him; of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life."

The Baptist follows the Presbyterian church as servilely as the Methodist church follows the English hierarchy. But she avows her faith that immersion is a *sign* of remission. A sign of the past, the present, or the future! A sign accompanying!

Calvin and Wesley are with us here. Calvin makes remission the principal thing in baptism.—*Inst. l.* 4, *c.* xv. p. 327.

"Baptism," says he, "resembles a legal instrument properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are cancelled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us. For he commands all who believe to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore, those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which was the *principal* thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise—"He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved."

John Wesley, in his comment on the New Testament, (page 350,) speaks plainer than either the Methodist Discipline or the Regular Baptist Confession. His words are:—"Baptism administered to real penitents, is both a *means* and a *seal* of pardon. Nor did God ordi-

narily, in the primitive church, bestow this (pardon) on any, unless through this means." This is almost, if not altogether, as much as we have said on the forgiveness of sins through immersion.

May we not say, that we have sustained this last proposition to the full extent of the terms thereof?

With the testimony of John Wesley, the last of the reformers, I close my list of human vouchers for the import of christian immersion. This list I could swell greatly; for, indeed, I have been quite disappointed in looking back into creeds, councils, commentators, and reformers, ancient and modern. I begin to fear, that I should be suspected to have come to the conclusions, which I have exhibited from consulting human writings, creeds, and reformers My fears are not that we, who plead for reformation, may appear to have nothing *original* to offer in this reformation; that we are mere gleaners in the fields which other minds have cultivated. It is not on this account our fears are excited: for the reformation we plead is not characterized by new and original ideas, or human inventions; but by a return to the original ideas and institutions developed in the New Institution. Nor do we profess to have any originality of mind, strength of reason, or compass of imagination worthy of admiration, worthy of a temple, or a memorial of any sort whatever. But we fear lest any should suspect the views offered to be a human invention or tradition; because we have found so much countenance for them in the works of the most ancient and renowned christian writers, and the creeds of ancient and modern reformers. We can assure our readers, that we have been led to these conclusions from the simple perusal, unprejudiced and impartial examination, of the New Testament alone. And, we may add, that we are as much astonished, as any reader of this essay can be, to find such a cloud of witnesses to the truth, and importance of the views offered.

Though we had, many years ago, read most of these documents, we read them as many of our readers read the Bible; without attending to what is read, or feeling the import of it. We can sympathize with those who have this doctrine in their own creeds unregarded, and unheeded in its import and utility; for we exhibited it fully in our debate with Mr. M'Calla, 1823, without feeling its great importance, and without beginning to practise upon its tendencies for some time afterwards. But since it has been fully preached and practised upon, it has proved itself to be all divine.

We now press it upon all persons to believe the gospel, and to be immersed for the remission of their sins; that seasons of refreshment from the Lord, may come to them. Every one who has so much faith in the mission and character of Jesus Christ, and so much attachment to his person as to submit to his absolute government, we invite, command, entreat, to receive the bounty, and enlist during the war; to put on his regimentals, to stand in the ranks, and to fight the good fight of faith. We discover, in practice, that this change of state, this seal of remission, changes the affections still more and more, and reforms the lives of all who honestly submit to

it. It produces more peace, love, joy, righteousness, and more holiness of heart and life, than we ever witnessed to result from the Calvinian, Arminian, or mixed gospels of the day. We love the ancient gospel for its fruits, its holiness of heart, and righteousness of life. None, but those who have frequently witnessed it, can form any adequate idea of the impulse which is given to the mind by a believing reception of this washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit. Like a strong impulse given to a ball which puts it in motion, immersion for the forgiveness of sins, carries the mind forward, far beyond all the experiences formerly demanded as preparatory to immersion. A change of state so great, so sensible, so complete, so sudden, operates more like the ancient cures, than the cold, dark, and tedious mental regenerations of the philosophizing theologues. He, that passes from Virginia into Pennsylvania, passes over a mere imaginary geographical line, without scarcely perceiving the transition; but he that passes from Virginia into the state of Ohio by swimming the river, the natural and sensible boundary, immediately realizes the change. Still greater, and more sensible is the change from the state of condemnation to the state of favor.

But to return to the argument. The propositions now proved, and illustrated, must convince all, that there is *some connexion* between immersion, and the forgiveness of sins. What that connexion is, may be disputed by some; but that such a connexion exists, none can dispute, who acknowleges the New Testament to contain a divine communication to man. With John Wesley we say, it is "to the believing the *means* and *seal* of pardon for all previous offences;" and we not only say we *think* so, but we preach it as such, and practise it as such. Those who think of any other connexion, would do well to attempt to form clear ideas of what they mean: for we are assured there is no meaning in any other connexion. To make it a commemorative sign of past remission is an outrage upon all rules of interpretation, and a perfect anomaly in all the revelation of God. To make it, prospectively, the sign of a future remission, is liable to the same exceptions. Nothing remains, but that it be considered, what it is in truth, the accompanying sign of an accompanying remission; the sign and the seal, or the means and the seal of remission then granted through the water, connected with the blood of Jesus by the divine appointment, and through our faith in it.

We have heard some objections, and we can conceive of new objections which may be presented to *immersion for the remission of sins*. Some of them are anticipated and attended to in the preceding remarks. We could wish that we had them all drawn up numerically, that we might examine and refute them. There can be objections made to any person, doctrine, sentiment, or practice, natural, moral, political, or religious, which ever existed. But notwithstanding all the objections made to every thing, there are thousands of matters and things we hold to be facts and truths indubitable. Amongst those certain and sure things, not to be shaken, is this christian institution.

We will state and examine some objections partially noticed already; but, because they are the most common, or may become common, we will bestow upon them a formal statement, and a formal refutation.

*Objection* 1.—"To make the attainment, and the enjoyment of *present salvation*, pardon, justification, sanctification, reconciliation, adoption, dependent upon the contingency of water being present, or accessible, is beneath the dignity and character of a salvation from God."

And to make the attainment, and the enjoyment of present salvation, pardon, &c. dependent upon the contingency of faith being present or accessible —upon the blood of Jesus Christ being heard of, or known, is equally objectionable:—for what is faith but the belief of testimony? Or what is it in the most popular sense but something wrought in the heart, a compound of knowledge and feeling, of assent and consent? And what was the blood of Jesus shed upon Mt. Calvary but matter, and a few pounds of matter, viewed by itself abstractly as some view water; I say, what was it but matter? And are not both blood and faith less accessible to mankind than the element of water? How much more water than faith, or candidates for immersion? And is there not as much power, wisdom, and goodness of God in creating water, as in creating air, words, letters, faith, &c. Is not water more universal than language, words, books, preachers, faith, &c. This objection lies as much against any one means of salvation as another; nay, against all means of salvation. When ever a case shall occur of much faith and little water; or of a little faith and no water, we will repel it by other arguments than these.

*Objection* 2.—"It makes void the value, excellency, and importance of both faith and grace." By no means. If a man say, with Paul, we are justified by faith; does it follow that grace is made void? Or, if one say we are justified by grace; does it make the blood of Christ of none effect? Or, if, with Paul, a man say we are justified by his blood; does it make faith, repentance, and grace of no effect? Nay, indeed, this gives to faith its proper place, and its due value. It makes it the principle of action. It brings us to the water, to Christ, and to heaven. *But it is as a principle of action only.* It was not Abel's faith in his head, or heart; but Abel's faith at *the altar* which obtained such reputation. It was not Enoch's faith in principle, but Enoch's faith in his *walk with* God, which translated him to heaven. It was not Noah's faith in God's promise and threatening, but his faith exhibited in *building an ark*, which saved himself and family from the Deluge, and made him an heir of a new world, an heir of righteousness. It was not Abraham's faith in God's call, but his *going out* in obedience to that call, that first distinguished him as a pilgrim, and began his reputation. It was not faith in God's promise that Jericho should fall, but that faith carried out in the *blowing of rams' horns*, which laid its walls in ruins, &c. It is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our *going down* into the water that obtains the remission of sins. But any one may see why faith has so much praise, and is of so much value. Because, without it, Abel would not have offered more sacrifices than Cain; Enoch would not have walked with God; Noah would not have built an ark; Abraham would not have left Ur of the Chaldees, nor offered up his son upon the altar. Without it, Israel would not have passed through the wilderness, nor crossed the Jordan; and without it, none receive the remission of their sins in immersion. And, again, we would remind the reader, that when he talks of being saved by faith, he should bear in mind, that grace is not lost sight of; nor blood, nor water, nor reformation, discarded.

We enter the kingdom of nature by being born of the flesh. We enter the kingdom of heaven, or come under the reign of Jesus Christ, in this life, by being born of water, and the Spirit. We enter the kingdom of eternal glory by being born again from the earth, and neither by faith, nor the first regeneration. Neither by faith, nor baptism; but by being counted worthy of the resurrection of the just. "I was hungry, and you fed me." Not because

you believed, or were born of water; but, because "I was hungry, and you fed me," &c.

There are three births, three kingdoms, and three salvations. One from the womb of our first mother, one from the water, and one from the grave. We enter a new world on, and not before, each birth. The present animal life, after the first birth; the spiritual, or the life of God in our souls, after the second birth, and the life eternal in the presence of God, after the third birth. And he, who dreams of entering the second kingdom, or coming under the dominion of Jesus, without the second birth—may, to complete his error, dream of entering the kingdom of glory without a resurrection from the dead.

Grace precedes all these births—shines in all the kingdoms, but will be glorified in the third. Sense is the principle of action in the first kingdom; faith, in the second; and sight spiritual, in the third. The first salvation is that of the body from the dangers and ills of life, and God is thus "the Saviour of all men." The second salvation is that of the soul from sin. The third is that of both soul and body united, delivered from moral and natural corruption, and introduced into the presence of God, when God shall be all in all.

*Objection* 3.—"It is so uncharitable to the Paidobaptists!" And how uncharitable are the Paidobaptists to Jews, Turks, and Pagans!! Will they promise present salvation from the guilt, pollution, and the dominion of sin, with the well grounded hope of heaven, to Jews, Turks, Pagans, or even Roman Catholics? Or will the Roman Catholics to them!! How uncharitable are they who cry "*uncharitable*" to us! Infants, idiots, deaf, and dumb persons, innocent Pagans wherever they can be found, with all the pious Paidobaptists, we commend to the mercy of God. But such of them as wilfully *neglect* this salvation, and who, having the opportunity to be immersed for the remission of their sins, wilfully neglect or refuse, we have as little hope for them as they have for all who refuse salvation *on their own terms of the gospel.* While they inveigh against us for laying a scriptural and rational stress upon immersion, do we not see that they lay as great, though an unscriptural and irrational, stress upon their baptism or sprinkling; so much so, as to give it *without faith,* even to infants, so soon as they are born of the flesh?

*Objection* 4.—"But do not many of them enjoy the present salvation of God?" How far they may be happy in the peace of God, and the hope of heaven, I presume not to say. And we know so much of human nature as to say, that he, that *imagines* himself pardoned, will feel happy as he that is really so. But one thing we do know, that none can *rationally,* and with *certainty,* enjoy the peace of God, and the hope of heaven, but they who intelligently, and in full faith are born of water, or immersed for the remission of their sins. And as the testimony of God, and not conceit, imagination, nor our reasoning upon what passes in our minds, is the ground of our certainty, we see and feel, that we have an assurance which they cannot have. And we have this advantage over them, we once stood upon their ground, had their hopes, felt their assurance; but they have not stood upon our ground, nor felt our assurance. Moreover, the experience of the first converts shows the difference between their immersion, and the immersions, or sprinklings, of modern gospels.

*Objection* 5.—"This has been so long concealed from the people, and so lately brought to our view, that we cannot acquiesce in it."

This objection would have made unavailing every attempt at reformation, or illumination of the mind, or change in the condition and enjoyments of society, ever attempted. Besides, do not the experience of all the religious —the observation of the intelligent—the practical result of all creeds, reformations, and improvements—and the expectations, and longings of society, warrant the conclusion that either some new revelation, or some new developement of the revelation of God, must be made, before the hopes and expectations of all true christians can be realized, or christianity save and reform the nations of this world. We want the old gospel back, and sustained by the

ancient order of things: and this alone, by the blessing of the Divine Spirit, is all that we do want, or can expect, to reform and save the world. And if this gospel, as proclaimed and enforced on Pentecost, cannot do this, vain are the hopes, and disappointed must be the expectations of the, so called, christian world.

## RECAPITULATION.

As christian faith rests upon, and christian practice proceeds from, *the testimony of God*, and not from the reasonings of men, in this recapitulation I will only call up the evidences on one single proposition, assumed, sustained, and illustrated in the preceding pages—and that is the *ninth proposition*, as sustained by the apostolic testimony. We wish to leave before the mind of the diligent reader the great importance attached to christian immersion, as presented in the Evangelists, the Acts, and the Epistles.

1. *In the Evangelists*—It is called *the forgiveness of sins*. Matthew and Mark introduce the Messiah in his own person in giving the commission. Luke does not. Matthew presents Jesus, saying, "Go, convert the nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you." This, of course, in order to salvation. Mark presents him, saying, "Go into all the world, proclaim the glad tidings to the whole creation: he who believes, and is immersed, shall be saved; and he who believes not, shall be condemned." Luke, however, does not introduce the Lord in his own person in giving the charge; but records it, in his own conception of it, in the following words;—That "reformation and forgiveness of sins should be announced in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." No person, we presume, will question but that Luke thus records the commission;—and, if so, then it is indisputable that, as Luke neither mentions faith nor immersion, he substitutes for them the received import of both, when and where he wrote. Metonymically he places repentance, or rather *reformation*, for faith; and *remission of sins* for immersion. In Luke's acceptation and time forgiveness of sins stood for immersion, and reformation for faith—the effect for the means or cause. In the commission salvation is attached by the Lord Jesus to faith and immersion into his name. He that believes, and is immersed, shall be saved. Thus immersion is taught in the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

2. *In the Acts of the Apostles*—Sermon 1, Peter says, "Reform and be immersed, every one of you, into the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Sermon 2, he says, "Reform and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out; that seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come, and that he may send Jesus," &c. In the same discourse, he says, "God having raised up his Son Jesus, has sent him to bless you, every one of you, turning from his iniquities. In his 3d Sermon, recorded Acts x. he says, "To him all the Prophets bear witness, that every one who believes in him shall receive remission of sins *by his name*. Paul at Antioch, in Pisidia, declares, that through Jesus was proclaimed the remission of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things. Ananias commanded Paul to arise and be immersed, and to wash away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. Thus it is spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles.

3. *In the Epistles*—The Romans are said to have been immersed into Christ Jesus—into his death; to have been buried with him, and consequently to have risen with him, and to walk in a new life. The Corinthians are said to have been washed, justified, and sanctified by the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God. The Galatians "were immersed into Christ, and had put him on." The Ephesians were married to Christ by immersion, as brides were wont to be washed in order to their nuptials. The assembly of the disciples, called *the congregation of the Lord*, making the bride of Christ, were said to be *cleansed* by *the bath of water* and *the word*. The Colossians were *buried with Christ, raised with him*, and are said to have been *forgiven all trespasses* when they were raised with him, (chapter ii. 11, 13, 14, where

their resurrection with Jesus and their having all sins forgiven are connected.) All the saints are said to be saved by immersion, or "the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit."—Titus iii. 5. The believing Jews had their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and their bodies washed with clean water, or water which made clean. Peter taught all the saints in Pontus, Galatia, Capadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, that the water of baptism saved them, as the water of the Deluge saved Noah in the Ark; and that in immersion a person was purged from all his former sins. And John the Apostle represents the saved as having "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," and all the baptized little children as "having their sins forgiven." Such are the evidences found in the Epistles. How numerous! how clear! and how unequivocal! Are we not, then, warranted to say, Except a man be regenerated of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God? and that all who, believing, are immersed for the remission of their sins, have the remission of their sins in and through immersion?

## CONCLUSION.

A word to the regenerated.—You have experienced the truth of the promise, and being induced by that promise, you have become, like Isaac, the children of promise. You heard the testimony of God concerning Jesus of Nazareth, and you believed it. You were, in consequence of your faith, so disposed towards the person of Jesus, as to be willing to put yourselves under his guidance. This faith and this will brought you to the water. You were not ashamed, nor afraid to confess him before men. You solemnly declared you regarded him as God's only Son, and the only Saviour of men. You vowed allegiance to him. Down into the water you were led. Then the name of the Holy One upon your faith, and upon your person, was pronounced. You were then buried in the water under that name. It closed itself upon you. In its womb you were concealed. Into the Lord, as in the water, you were immersed. But in the water you continued not. Of it you were born, and from it you came forth, raised with Jesus, and rising in his strength. There your consciences were released; for there your old sins were purged away. And although you received not the gifts of the Holy spirit, which confirmed the testimony to the first disciples, you felt the powers of the world to come, were enlightened, and tasted the bounty of God: for seasons of refreshment from the presence of God came upon you. Your hearts were sprinkled from evil consciences, when your bodies were washed in the cleansing water. Then into the kingdom of Jesus, you entered. The King of righteousness, of peace, and joy, extended his sceptre over you, and sanctified in state, and in the Spirit, you rejoiced in the Lord with joy unspeakable and full of glory. Being washed, you were sanctified, as well as acquitted. And now you find yourselves under the great Advocate, so that sin cannot lord it over you; for you always look to the great Advocate to intercede for you, and thus if sin should overtake you, you confess and forsake it, and always find mercy. Adopted thus into the family of God, you have not only received the name, the rank, and the dignity; but also the Spirit of a son of God, and find, as such, that you are kings, priests, and heirs of God. You now feel that all things are yours, because you are Christ's; and

Christ is God's. The hope of the coming regeneration of the heavens and the earth, at the resurrection of the just, animates you. You look for the redemption, the adoption of your bodies, and their transfiguration. For this reason; you purify yourselves even as he is pure. Be zealous, then, children of God; publish the excellencies of him who has called you into this marvellous light and bliss. Be diligent, that you may receive the crown that never fades, and that you may eat of the tree of life which grows in the midst of the Paradise of God. If you suffer with Jesus, you will reign with him. If you should deny him, he will deny you. Add, then, to your faith, courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, brotherly kindness, and universal benevolence; for if you continue in these things and abound, you shall not be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But should you be deficient in these things, your light will be obscured, and a forgetfulness that you have been purified from your old sins, will come upon you. Do, then, brethren, labor to make your calling and election sure; for thus practising, you shall never fall; but shall have an easy and abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

A word to the unregenerate.—Amongst you are sundry classes of character. Some of you who believe the gospel, and are changed in heart, quickened by the Spirit, are not generally ranked amongst the unregenerate. In the popular sense of this term, you are regenerate. But we use it in its scriptural acceptation. Like Nicodemus, and like Joseph of Arimathea, you believe in Jesus, and are willing to take lessons from him in the chambers. You have confidence in his mission, respect and venerate, and even love his person; and would desire to be under his government. Marvel not that I say to you, *You must be born again.* Pious as you are supposed to be, and as you may think yourselves to be, unless you are born again, you cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Cornelius and his family were as devout and as pious as any of you. "He feared God, gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God continually." Yet, mark it well, I beseech you, it was necessary "*to tell him words* by which himself and his house *might be saved.*" These words were told him; he believed them, and received the Holy Spirit; yet still he must be born again. For a person cannot be said to be born again *of any thing which he receives*; and still less of miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit. He was immersed, and into the kingdom of God he came. He was then saved. You need not ask how, or why, these things are so. Do as Cornelius did, and then you will think of it in another light—then you would not for a world be unregenerate. To have the pledge, the promise, and seal of God of the remission of all your sins, to be adopted into his family, and to receive the Spirit of a son of God, be assured my pious friends, are matters of no every day occurrence; and when you feel yourselves constitutionally invested with all these blessings, in God's own way, you will say, that "his ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts, for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are his ways higher

than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts." It is hard to make a slave feel and act as a freeman. As difficult, we often find it, to make the unregenerate feel and know the value and importance of regeneration. But the regenerate would not be unregenerate for the Universe.

God has one way of bestowing every thing. We cannot gather grapes off thorns, nor figs off thistles. The reason is, there they do not grow. We can tell no other reason why they cannot grow there; but that they do not grow there. We cannot have any blessing, but in God's own way of giving it. We cannot find wool save on the back of the sheep, nor silk save from the worm which spins it from itself. Corn and wheat cannot be obtained, but from those plants which yield them. Without the plant, we cannot have the fruit. This is the economy of the whole material system. And in the world of spirits, and spiritual influences, is it not the same? Moral law is as unchangeable, as the laws of nature. Moral means and ends are as inseparable as natural means and ends. God cannot bestow grace upon the proud, and cannot withhold it from the humble. He does not do it, and that is enough. He could shower down wheat and corn, and give us rivers of milk and wine, were it a question of mere power. But taking all together, his wisdom, power, and goodness, he cannot do it. So neither can he give us faith without testimony, hope without a promise, love without an amiable object, peace without purity, nor heaven without holiness. He cannot give to the unborn infant the light of the Sun, the vivacity which the air imparts, nor the agility and activity which liberty bestows. He does not do it, and, therefore, we say, he cannot do it. Neither can he bestow the blessings of the Reign of Heaven upon those who are children of disobedience.

I know how reluctant men are to submit to God's government; and yet they must all bow to it at last. "To Jesus every knee shall bow, and to him every tongue must confess." But they will object to bowing *now*, and torture invention for excuses. They will tell me all that I have said is true of natural and moral means and ends; but immersion is not a moral means, because God forgave sins and saved men before immersion was appointed. "It is a *positive*, and not a *moral* institution." And is there no moral influence connected with positive institutions? A *written* law is a positive institution: for moral law existed before written law. But because it has become a positive institution, has its moral power ceased? *The moral influence of all positive institutions is God's* WILL *expressed in them.* And it matters not whether it be the *eating* or *not eating* of an apple, the building of an altar, or the building it with, or without the aid of iron tools; the offering of a kid, a lamb, a bullock or a pigeon, it is just as morally binding, and has the same moral influence, as, "You shall honor your father and mother;" or, "You shall not kill." It is THE WILL OF GOD in any institution, which gives it all its moral and physical power. No man could now be pardoned as Abel was—as Enoch was—as David was—as the thief upon the cross was. These all lived before the *second* will of God was declared. He took away "*the first will*,"

says Paul, "that he might establish the *second will*," by which we are sanctified. We are not pardoned as were the Jews or the Patriarchs. It was not till Jesus was buried and rose again, that an acceptable offering for sin was presented in the heavens. By one offering up of himself, he has perfected the conscience of the immersed or sanctified. Since his oblation, a new institution for remission has been appointed. You need not flatter yourselves, that God will save or pardon you, except for Christ's sake; and if his name is not assumed by you, if you have not put him on, if you have not come under his advocacy, you have not the name of Christ to plead, nor his intercession on your behalf—and, therefore, for Christ's sake you cannot be forgiven. Could Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Aaron, think you, if living now—could they, I ask, find forgiveness at the altar? And will you imagine, that he, who honored every institution by Moses, by connecting rewards and punishments with the obedience or disobedience of his commands, be less jealous for the honor of the institution of his Son? And will that Son who, for no other purpose than to honor his Father's institution, was immersed in the Jordan, bestow pardon or salvation upon any who refuse to honor him, and him that sent him? He has been graciously pleased to adapt means to ends. He has commanded immersion for the remission of sins, and think you that he will change his institution, because of your stubborn or intractable disposition. As well, as reasonably might you pray for loaves from heaven, or manna, because Israel eat it in the desert, as to pray for pardon while you refuse the remission of your sins by immersion.

Demur not because of the simplicity of the thing. Remember how simple was the eating of the fruit of that tree, "whose mortal taste brought death into the world, and all our woe." How simple was the rod in the hand of Moses when stretched over Egypt and the Red Sea. How simple was looking at the brazen serpent. And how simple are all God's institutions. How simple the aliments of nature; the poisons too, and their remedies. Where the will of God is, there is omnipotence. 'Twas simple to speak the universe into existence. But God's will gives efficacy to every thing. And obedience ever was, and ever will be, the happiness of man. It is the happiness of Heaven. 'Tis God's philanthropy which has given us something to obey. To the angels who sinned he has given no command. 'Twas gracious to give us a command to live—a command to reform—a command to be born again—to live for ever. Remember light and life first came by obedience. If God's voice had not been obeyed, the water would not have brought forth the earth, nor would the sun have blessed it by his rays. The obedience of law was goodness and mercy; but the obedience of faith is favor, and life, and glory everlasting. None to whom this gospel is announced will perish, except those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son. Kiss, then, the Son, lest he be angry, and you perish for ever.

To the unregenerate of all classes, whose education and prejudices compel them to assent to the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, and Jude.—You own the mission of Jesus

from the bosom of the Eternal—and that is *all* you do! Each of you is living without God and without hope in the world—aliens from the family of God—of various ranks and grades among men; but all involved in one condemnation, because light has come into the world, and you love darkness, and the works of darkness, rather than the light. To live without hope is bad enough; but to live in constant dread of the vengeance of Heaven, is still worse. But do you tremble not at the word of God?

If you can be saved here, or hereafter, then there is no meaning in language, no pain in the universe, no truth in God---Death, the grave, and destruction have no meaning. The frowns of Heaven are all smiles, if you perish not in your ways.

But you purpose to bow to Jesus, and to throw yourselves upon his mercy at last. Impious thought! When you have given the strength of your intellect, the vigor of your constitution, the warmth of your affections, and the best energies of your life, to the world, the flesh, and the Devil; you will stretch out your palsied hands, and turn your dim eyes to the Lord, and say, 'Lord, have mercy upon me?' The first fruits, and the fatlings for the Devil, and the lame and the blind for God, is the purpose of your heart; and the best resolution you can form!

The thief upon the cross, had he done so, could not have found mercy. 'Tis one thing to have known the way of salvation, assented to it, and to have in deliberate resolution rejected it for the present, with a promise of obeying it at some future period, and to have never known it, nor assented to it, till the end of life. Promise not, then, to yourselves what has never happened to others. The Devil has always said, "You may give *to-morrow* to the Lord—only give to me *to-day*." This has been all that he has asked, and this is what you are disposed to give. Promise not *to-morrow* to the Lord, for you will be still less disposed to give it when it comes; and the Lord has not asked you for *to-morrow*. He says, TO-DAY, when you shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts. But you say, you are willing to come to the Lord *to-day* if you knew the way, or if you were *prepared!* Well, what does the Lord require of you as *preparation?* He once said, "Let the wicked man forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him turn to the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." He says also, "Draw nigh to me, and I will draw nigh to you;" "Cleanse your hands, you sinners; and purify your hearts, you men of two souls;" "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings;" "Reform and be converted;" "Turn to the Lord;" "Be immersed for the remission of your sins;" and "Submit to the government of Jesus." "What! just as I am!" Pray, how are you? Have you such a persuasion in your heart of the mission of Jesus, as God's own Son, and the only Saviour; and have you so much confidence in his personal character as to be willing to surrender yourself to him for the present and the future—for time and eternity? "I have," you say. As one that has heard his voice, I say then, Come and be regenerated, and seasons of refreshment from the Lord will come to you.

"But I thought I ought to feel like a christian first, and to have the experience of a christian, before I came to the Lord." Indeed! Did the Lord tell you so? "His ministers taught me so." It is hard knowing who are his ministers now a-days. His *commissioned* ministers taught you not so. They were not taught to say so. The Master knew that to wait for health before we went to the physician; to seek for warmth before we approached the fire; to wait till we ceased to be hungry before ever we approached the table---was not reasonable. And therefore, he never asked, as he never expected, any one to feel like a christian before he was immersed, and began to live like a christian. None but the citizens of any country can experience the good or evil of the government which presides over it. None but the married can experience the conjugal relation and feelings. None but sons and daughters can have the experience of sons and daughters; and none but those who obey the gospel can experience the sweets of obedience. I need not add, that none but the disobedient can experience the pains, the fears, and terrors of the Lord, the shame and remorse which are the first fruits of the anguish and misery which await them in another world. As the disobedient, who stumble at the word, have the first fruits of the awful destruction from the presence of the Lord, which awaits them; so the obedient have the first fruits of the Spirit---the salvation of their souls, as an earnest until the salvation to be revealed at the coming of the Lord.

And now let me ask all the unregenerate, What do you propose to yourselves by either delaying or refusing to come to the Lord? Will delaying have any tendency to fit you or prepare you for his salvation? Will your lusts have less power, or sin have less dominion over you by continuing under their control? Has the intoxicating cup by indulgence diminished a taste for it? Has the avarice of the miser been weakened or cured by yielding to it? Has any propensity been destroyed by gratifying it, in any other way than as it destroyed the animal system? Can you, then, promise yourselves that, by continuing in disobedience, you will love obedience, and be more inclined to submit when you have longer resisted the Spirit of God! Presume not on the mercy of God, but in the way that mercy flows. Grace has its channels, as the waters have their courses; and its path, as the lightning of the clouds. Each has its law, as fixed as the throne of God; and think not that God will work a miracle for your salvation.

Think you that the family of Noah could have been saved if they had refused to enter into the Ark? Could the first born of Israel have escaped the destroying angel, but in houses sprinkled with blood? or could Israel have escaped the wrath of Pharaoh, but by being immersed into Moses in the cloud and in the sea? These things are written for our admonition upon whom the consummation of past ages has come. Arise, then, and be immersed, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. The *many who refuse grace* will neither prove you wise nor safe in disobedience.

"Multitudes are no mark—That you will right be found;
A few were saved in the Ark,—For many millions drown'd.
Obey the gospel call,—And enter while you may:
Christ's flock have long been small,—But none are safe but they!"

**FINIS.**

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.
—EXTRA.—*NO. II.*

BETHANY, Va. DECEMBER, 1830

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

## THE BREAKING OF THE LOAF.

MAN was not made for the Christian Institution; but the Christian Institution for man. None but a master of the human constitution—none but one perfectly skilled in all the animal, intellectual, and moral endowments of man, can perfectly adapt an institution to man in reference to all that he is, and to all that he is destined to become. Such is the Christian Institution. Its evidences of a divine origin increase and brighten in the ratio of our progress in the science of man. He who most attentively and profoundly reads himself, and contemplates the picture which the Lord of this Institution has drawn of him, will be most willing to confess, that man is wholly incapable of originating it. He is ignorant of himself, and of the race from which he sprang, who can persuade himself that man, in any age, or in any country, was so far superior to himself as to have invented such an Institution as the Christian. That developement of man, in all his natural, moral, and religious relations, which the Great Teacher has given, is not farther beyond the intellectual powers of man, than is the creation of the Sun, Moon, and Stars beyond his physical powers.

The eye of man cannot see itself; the ear of man cannot hear itself, nor the understanding of man descern itself: but there is one who sees the human eye, who hears the human ear, and who discerns the human understanding. He it is who alone is skilled in revealing man to himself, and himself to man. He who made the eye of man, can he not see? He who made the ear of man, can he not hear? He who made the heart of man, can he not know?

It is as supernatural to adapt a system to man, as it is to create him. He has never thought much upon his own powers who has not seen as much wisdom on the outside, as in the inside of the human head. To suit the outside to the inside required as much wisdom as to suit the inside to the outside, and yet the exterior arrangement exists for the interior. To fashion a casement for a human soul exhibits as many attributes of a creator, as to fashion a human spirit for its

habitation. Man, therefore, could as easily make himself, as a system of religion to suit himself. It will be admitted that it calls for as much skill to adapt the appendages to the human eye, as the human eye to its appendages. To us it is equally plain, that it requires as much wisdom to adapt a religion to man, circumstanced as he is, as to create him an intellectual and moral being.

But to understand the Christian Religion, we must study it; and to enjoy it, we must practise it. To come into the kingdom of Jesus Christ is one thing, and to live as a wise, a good, and a happy citizen, is another. As every human kingdom has its constitution, laws, ordinances, manners, and customs; so has the kingdom of the Great King. He, then, who would be a good and a happy citizen of it, must understand and submit to its constitution, laws, ordinances, manners, and customs.

The object of the present essay is to develope one of the institutions or ordinances of this kingdom: and this we shall attempt by stating, illustrating, and sustaining the following propositions:—

PROPOSITION I.

*There is a house on earth, called the house of God.*

The Most High God dwells not in temples made with human hands; yet he condescended in the age of types to have a temple erected for himself which he called his house, and glorified it with the symbols of his presence. In allusion to this the Christian community, organized under the government of his Son, is called his house and temple. "You are God's building," says Paul to a Christian community. This building is said to be "built upon the Apostles and Prophets—Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." "Know you not that you are the temple of God? The temple of God is holy, which temple you are," 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.

But in allusion to the Jewish temple, the Christian church occupies the middle space between the outer court and the holiest of all. "The holy places made with hands were figures of the true." The common priests went *always* into the first tabernacle or holy place, and the high priest *once a year* into the *holiest of all.* Thus our Great High Priest went *once for all* into the true "holiest of all," into the real presence of God, and has permitted us Christians as a royal priesthood, as a chosen race, to enter always into the only holy place now on earth, the Christian church. "As living stones we are built up into a *spiritual house*, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices most acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. ii. 5.

But all we aim at here is to show that the community under Christ is called "*the house of God.*" Paul once calls it *a* house of God, and once *the* house of God. An individual or single congregation, he calls "*a house of God.*" 1 Tim. iii. 15. I have written to you, "that you may know how to behave yourself in a house of God (Greek,—*oikos Theou*) which is the congregation of God." And in his letter to the Hebrews, chap. x. 21, speaking of the whole Christian community, he calls it the house of God (*ho oikos Theou.*) "Having a

Great High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near," &c. —It is, then, apparent that there is under the Lord Messiah now on earth an institution called *the house of God;* and this resembles the *holy place* between the outer court and the holiest of all, which is the proposition to be proved.

PROPOSITION II.

*In the house of God there is always the table of the Lord.*

As there is an analogy between the Jewish holy place and the Christian house of God; so there is an analogy between the furniture of the first tabernacle or holy place, and those who officiated in it, and the furniture of the Christian house of God and those who officiate in it. "In the first tabernacle, says Paul, which is called *holy*, there were the candlestick, and the table, and the showbread," or the loaves of the presence. On the golden table every Sabbath day were placed *twelve* loaves which were exhibited there for one week, and on the next Sabbath they were substituted by twelve fresh loaves sprinkled over with frankincense. The loaves which were removed from the table were eaten by the priests. These were called in the Hebrew "*the loaves of the faces*," or the loaves of the presence. This emblem of the abundance of spiritual food in the presence of God for all who dwell in the holy place, stood always upon the golden table furnished by the twelve tribes, even in the wilderness. The light in the first tabernacle was not from *without*, but from the seven lamps placed on the golden candlestick; emblematic of the perfect light not derived from this world which is enjoyed in the house of God.

If, then, in the emblematic house of God, to which corresponds the Christian house of God. there was not only a table overlaid with gold, always spread, and on it displayed *twelve large loaves*, or cakes, sacred memorials and emblems of God's bounty and grace; shall we say that in that house, over which Jesus is a Son, there is not to stand always a table more precious than gold covered with a richer repast for the holy and royal priesthood which the Lord has instituted who may always enter into the holy place consecrated by himself.

But we are not dependent on analogies, nor far fetched inferences, for the proof of this position. Paul who perfectly understood both the Jewish and Christian Institutions, tells us, that there is in the Christian temple a table, appropriately called the Lord's table, as a part of its furniture. He informs those who were in danger of being polluted by idolatry, "that they could not be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of demons." 1 Cor. x. 21. In all his allusions to this table in this connexion, he represents it as continually approached by those in the Lord's house. "The cup of the Lord" and "the loaf," for which thanks were continually offered, are the furniture of this table, to which the Christian brotherhood have free access.

The Apostle Paul reminds the saints in Corinth of their familiarity with the Lord's table. in speaking of it as common as the meet-

ings of the brotherhood. "The cup of blessing for which we bless God, is it not the joint participation of the blood of Christ? The loaf which we break, is it not the joint participation of the body of Christ?" In this style we speak of things common and usual, never thus of things uncommon or unusual. It is not the cup which we *have* received with thanks; nor is it the loaf which we *have* broken; but which we *do* break. But all that we aim at here is now accomplished; for it has been shown that, *in the Lord's house there is always the table of the Lord.* It is scarcely necessary to add that if it be shown that in the Lord's house there is the Lord's table, as a part of the furniture, it must always be there when the disciples meet, unless it can be shown that only some occasions require its presence and others its absence; or that the Lord is poorer or more churlish at one time than at another; that he is not able always to keep a table, or too parsimonious to furnish it for his friends. But this is in anticipation of our subject, and we proceed to the third proposition.

PROPOSITION III.

*On the Lord's table there is of necessity but one loaf.*

The necessity is not that of a positive law enjoining one loaf and only one, as the ritual of Moses enjoined twelve loaves. But it is a necessity arising from the meaning of the Institution as explained by the Apostles. As there is but one literal body and but one mystical or figurative body having many members; so there must be but one loaf. The Apostle insists upon this, 1 Cor. 17, "Because there is one loaf, we, the many, are one body; for we are all partakers of that one loaf." The Greek word *artos*, especially when joined with words of number, says Dr. Macknight, always signifies *a loaf*, and is so translated in our Bibles, Matt. xvi. 9. "Do you not remember the *five loaves?*" There are many instances of the same sort. Dr. Campbell says "that in the plural number it ought always to be rendered loaves;" but when there is a numeral before it, it indispensably must be rendered loaf or loaves. Thus we say one loaf, seven loaves; not one bread, seven breads. "Because there is one loaf," says Paul, we must consider the whole congregation as one body. Here the Apostle reasons from what is more plain to what is less plain; from what was established to what was not so fully established in the minds of the Corinthians. There was no dispute about the one loaf; therefore, there ought to be none about the one body. This mode of reasoning makes it as certain as a positive law; because that which an Apostle reasons from must be an established fact, or an established principle. To have argued from an assumption or a contingency to establish the unity of the body of Christ, would have been ridiculous in a logician, and how unworthy of an Apostle! It was, then, an established institution that there is but one loaf, inasmuch as the Apostle establishes his argument by a reference to it as an established fact. Our third proposition is, then, sustained, that *on the Lord's table there is of necessity but one loaf.*

PROPOSITION IV.

*All Christians are members of the house or family of God, are*

*called and constituted a holy and a royal priesthood, and may, therefore, bless God for the Lord's table, its loaf, and cup—approach it without fear and partake of it with joy, as often as they please in remembrance of the death of their Lord and Saviour.*

The different clauses of this proposition, we shall sustain in order —"*all Christians are members of the family or house of God.*" Heb. iii. 6. "But Christ is trusted as a Son over *his own family;* whose family we are, provided we maintain our profession and boasted hope unshaken to the end;"—"*are called and constituted a holy and a royal priesthood.*" 1 Pet. ii. 5. You, also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual temple, a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices most acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." In the 9th verse of the same chapter, he says, "But you are an elect race, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood;" and this is addressed to all the brethren dispersed in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia.

May not, then, *holy* and *royal* priests thank God for the Lord's table, its loaf, and cup of wine? May they not, without a *human* priest to consecrate the way for them, approach the Lord's table and handle the loaf and cup? If the common priests did not fear to approach a golden table and to place upon it the loaves of the presence; if they feared not to take and eat that consecrated bread because priests according to the flesh—shall royal priests fear, without the intervention of human hands, to approach the Lord's table and to partake of the one loaf? If they should, they know not how to appreciate the consecration of Jesus, nor how to value their high calling and exalted designation as kings and priests to God. And may we not say that he who, invested with a little clerical authority, derived only from "the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition," if borrowed from the Romanists, says to them, "stand by; I am holier than thou"—may we not say that such a one is worse than Diotrephes who affected a pre-eminence, because he desecrates the royal priesthood of Jesus Christ, and calls him common and unclean who has been consecrated by the blood of the Son of God? Such impiety can only be found amongst them who worship the beast, and who have covenanted and agreed that none shall buy or sell, save those who receive a mark on their foreheads and letters patent in their hands. But allow common sense to whisper a word into the ears of a priest's "laymen," but Christ's "*royal priests.*" Do you not thank God for the cup while the priest stands by the table; and do you not handle the loaf and the cup when they come to you? And would not your thanksgiving have been as acceptable if the human mediator had not been there, and your participating as well pleasing to God and as consolitory to yourself if you had been the first that handled the loaf or the cup, as when you are the second or the fifty-second in order of location? Let reason answer these two questions, and see what comes of the haughty assumptions of your Protestant clergy!! But this only by the way.

I trust it is apparent that the royal priesthood may approach the Lord's table *without fear,* inasmuch as they are consecrated to officiate

by a blood as far superior to that which consecrated the fleshly priesthood, as the Lord's table, covered with the sacred emblems of the sacrifice of the Lord himself, is superior to the table which held only the twelve loaves of the presence; and as they are, to say the least, called by as holy and divine an election, and are as *chosen a race* of priests as were those sprung from the loins of Levi.

PROPOSITION V.

*The one loaf must be broken before the saints feast upon it, which has obtained for this institution the name of "the breaking of the loaf."*

But some, doubtless, will ask, 'Is it not called *the Lord's supper?*' Some have thought, amongst whom is Dr. Bell, that 1 Cor. xi. 20. applies to the feasts of love or charity, rather than the showing forth of the Lord's death. These may read the passage thus:—"But your coming together into one place is not to eat a Lord's supper; for in eating it every one takes first his own supper; alluding, as they suppose, to a love feast eaten before *the breaking of the loaf.*" But this Lord's supper is contradistinguished from their *own* supper. And might it not as reasonably be said you cannot call *your* showing forth the Lord's death a Lord's supper; for before eating it you have eaten a supper of your own, which prevents you from making a *supper* of it? You do not make it a Lord's supper if you first eat your own supper. Nor, indeed, could the Corinthians call any eating a "Lord's supper," conducted as was the eating of their own suppers; for one eat and drank to excess, while another who was poor, or had no supper to bring, was hungry, and put to shame. Could this be called a supper in honor of the Lord!

But as the Lord had eaten a religious supper, had partaken of the paschal lamb with his disciples, before he instituted the breaking of the loaf and drinking of the cup as commemorative of his death, it seems improper to call it a supper: for it was instituted and eaten *after a supper.*' Not in the sense of one of the meals of the day, can it be called either dinner or supper: for it supplies the place of no meal. *Deipnos*, here rendered *supper*, in the days of Homer, represented breakfast. Illiad, 2 line 381—399. and 8 line 53—66. It also signified food in general or a feast. In the times of Demosthenes it signified a feast or an evening meal. But it is of more importance to observe, that it is in the New Testament used figuratively as well as literally. Hence, we have the gospel blessings compared to a supper. We read of "the marriage supper of the Lamb," and "the supper of the Great God." Jesus says, "if any man oper to me I will (*deipneso*) take supper with him and he with me." When thus used it neither regards the time of day, nor the quantity eaten. If applied, then, to this institution it is figuratively, as it is elsewhere called "*the feast.*" For not only did the Lord appoint it, but in eating it we have communion with the Lord. The same idiom with the addition of the article occurs Revelation i. 10. "*he kuriake hemera*," the Lord's day. Upon the whole it appears more probable that the Apostle uses the words *kuriakos deipnos*, or

Lord's supper, as applicable to the breaking of the loaf for which they gave thanks in honor of the Lord, than to their own supper or the feasts of love, usual among the brethren. If we say in accordance with the Apostle's style, the Lord's day, the Lord's table, the Lord's cup, we may also say the Lord's supper. For in the Lord's house these are all sacred to him.

As the calling of Bible things by Bible names is an important item in the present reformation, we may here take occasion to remark, that both "the Sacrament" and "the Eucharist" are of human origin. The former was a name adopted by the Latin church; because the observance was supposed to be an oath or vow to the Lord; and as the term *sacramentum* signified an oath taken by a Roman soldier to be true to his general and his country, they presumed to call this institution a sacrament or oath to the Lord. By the Greek church it is called *the Eucharist* which word imparts *the giving of thanks*, because before participating, thanks were presented for the loaf and the cup. It is also called the communion, or "*the communion of the saints;*" but this might indicate that it is exclusively *the* communion of saints; and, therefore, it is more consistent to denominate it literally "the breaking of the loaf." But this is only preliminary to the illustration and proof of our fifth proposition.

We have said the loaf must be broken before the saints partake of it. Jesus took a loaf from the paschal table and broke it before he gave it to his disciples. They received a broken loaf, emblematic of his body once whole, but by his own consent, broken for his disciples. In eating it we then remember that the Lord's body was by his own consent broken or wounded for us. Therefore, he that gives thanks for the loaf should break it, not as the representative of the Lord, but after his example; and after the disciples have partaken of this loaf, handing it to one another, or while they are partaking of it the disciple who brake it partakes with them of the broken loaf—thus they all have communion with the Lord and with one another in eating the broken loaf. And thus they as priests feast upon his sacrifice. For the priests eat of the sacrifices and were thus partakers of the altar. The proof of all this is found in the institution given in Matthew xxvi. Mark xiv. Luke xxii. and 1 Cor. xi. In each of which his breaking of the loaf, *after* giving thanks, and *before* his disciples partook of it, is distinctly stated.

It is not, therefore, strange that the literal designation of this institution should be what Luke has given it in his Acts of the Apostles thirty years after its institution. The first time he notices it is Acts ii. 42. when he calls it emphatically *te klasei tou artou*, the breaking of the loaf, a name at the time of his writing, A. D. 64, universally understood. For, says he, in recording the piety and devotion of the first converts, "they continued stedfast in the teaching of the Apostles, in the fellowship, in *the breaking of the loaf*, in prayers—praising God." It is true there is more than breaking a loaf in this institution. But in accordance with general, if not universal usage, either that which is first or most prominent in laws, institutions, and

usages, gives a name to them. Thus we have our *Habeas Corpus*, our *Fieri Facias*, our *Nisi Prius*, our *Capias*, our *Venditioni Exponas*, names given from the first words of the law.

But to break a loaf, or *to break bread*, was a phrase common amongst the Jews to denote ordinary eating for refreshment. For example, Acts ii. 46. "Daily, with one accord, they continued in the temple and in breaking bread, or a loaf, from house to house. They eat their *food* with gladness and simplicity of heart." Also, after Paul had restored Eutychus at Troas, we are informed he brake a loaf and eat. Here it must refer to himself, not only because it is used *indefinitely*, but because he that eats is in the same number with him that breaks a loaf. But when an usage established is referred to, the article or some definitive term ascertains what is alluded to. Thus, Acts ii. 42. it is "*the* breaking of *the* loaf." And Acts xx. 7. it is, "They assembled for *the* breaking of a loaf." This loaf is explained by Paul, 1 Cor. x. 16. "*The* loaf which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ." This proposition being now, as we judge, sufficiently evident, we shall proceed to state our sixth.

PROPOSITION VI.

*The breaking of the loaf and the drinking of the cup are commemorative of the Lord's death.*

Upon the loaf and upon the cup of the Lord, in letters which speak not to the eye, but to the heart of every disciple, is inscribed,

*"When this you see, remember me."*

Indeed, the Lord says to each disciple when he receives the symbols in his hand, "This is my body broken for *you*. This is my blood shed for *you*." The loaf is thus constituted a representation of his body—first whole, then wounded for our sins. The cup is thus instituted a representation of his blood—once his life, but now poured out to cleanse us from our sins. To every disciple he says, For *you* my body was wounded; for *you* my life was taken. In receiving it the disciple says, 'Lord, I believe it. My life springs from your suffering; my joy from your sorrows; and my hope of glory everlasting from your humiliation and abasement unto death.' Each disciple, in handing the symbols to his fellow-disciple, says, in effect, 'You my brother, once an alien, are now a citizen of heaven; once a stranger, are now brought home to the family of God. You have owned my Lord as your Lord, my people as your people. Under Jesus the Messiah we are one. Mutually embraced in the everlasting arms, I embrace you in mine: thy sorrows shall be my sorrows, and thy joys my joys. Joint debtors to the favor of God and the love of Jesus, we shall jointly suffer with him, that we may jointly reign with him. Let us, then, renew our strength, remember our King, and hold fast our boasted hope unshaken to the end.'

"Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in christian love;
The fellowship of kindred minds
Is like to that above."

Here he knows no man after the flesh. Ties that spring from eternal

love, revealed in blood and addressed to his senses, draw forth all that is within him of complaisant affection and feeling, to those joint heirs with him of the grace of eternal life. While it represents to him "*the bread of life*"—all the salvation of the Lord—it is the strength of his faith, the joy of his hope, and the life of his love.*

This institution commemorates the love which reconciled us to God and always furnishes us with a new argument to live to him who died for us. Him who feels not the eloquence and power of this argument, all other arguments assail in vain. God's goodness, developed in creation and in his providence, is well designed to lead men to reformation. But the heart on which these fail, and to which Calvary appeals in vain, is past feeling, obdurate, and irreclaimable, beyond the operation of any moral power known to mortal man.

Every time the disciples assemble around the Lord's table they are furnished with a new argument also against sin, as well as with a new proof of the love of God. It is as well intended to crucify the world in our hearts, and to crucify our hearts to the world, as to quicken us to God, and to diffuse his love within us. Hence it must in reason be a stated part of the christian worship, in all christian assemblies; which leads us to state, illustrate, and sustain the following capital proposition, to which the preceding six are all preliminary.

PROPOSITION VII.

*The breaking of the one loaf, and the joint participation of the cup of the Lord, in commemoration of the Lord's death, usually called* "the Lord's Supper," *is an instituted part of the worship and edification of all christian congregations in all their stated meetings.*

ARGUMENT 1. The first christian congregation which met in Jerusalem, and which was constituted by the twelve Apostles, did as statedly attend upon the breaking of the loaf in their public meetings, as they did upon any other part of the christian worship. So Luke records, Acts ii. 42. "They continued stedfast in the Apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, in *the breaking of the loaf*, and in prayers. Ought we not, then, to continue as stedfast in the breaking of the loaf, as in the teaching of the Apostles, as in the fellowship, as in the prayers commanded by the Apostles?

ARGUMENT 2. The Apostles taught the churches to do all the Lord commanded. Whatever, then, the churches did by the appointment or concurrence of the Apostles, they did by the commandment of Jesus Christ. Whatever acts of religious worship the Apostles taught, or sanctioned in one christian congregation, they taught and sanctioned in all christian congregations, because all under the same government of one and the same King. But the church in Troas met upon the first day of the week, consequently all the churches met upon the first day of the week for religious purposes.

Among the acts of worship, or the institutions of the Lord, to which the disciples attended in these meetings, the breaking of the loaf was so conspicuous and so important, that the churches are said to meet on

*Christian Baptist, vol. 3, No. 1. In that volume, in the Fall of 1825, were written *four essays on the breaking of bread*, which see.

the first day of the week for this purpose. We are expressly told that the disciples at Troas met for this purpose; and what one church did by the authority of the Lord, as a part of his instituted worship, they all did. That the disciples in Troas met for this purpose is not to be inferred, for Luke says positively, (Acts xx. 7.) "And on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together for the breaking of a loaf, Paul, being about to depart on the morrow, discoursed with them, and lengthened out his discourse till midnight." From the manner in which this meeting of the disciples at Troas is mentioned by the historian, two things are very obvious—1st. That it was an established custom or rule for the disciples to meet on the first day of the week. 2d. That the primary object of their meeting was to break bread. They who object to breaking bread on *every* first day of the week when the disciples are assembled, usually preface their objections by telling us that Luke does not say they broke bread *every* first day; and yet they contend against the Sabbatarians that they ought to observe *every* first day to the Lord in commemoration of his resurrection. The Sabbatarians raise the same objection to this passage when adduced by all professors of christianity to authorize the weekly observance of the first day. They say that Luke does not tell us that they met for any religious purpose on *every* first day. How inconsistent, then, are they who make this sentence an express precedent for observing *every* first day when arguing against the Sabbatarians, and then turn round and tell us that it will not prove that they broke bread *every* first day! If it does not prove the one, it is most obvious it will not prove the other; for the weekly observance of this day, as a day of the meeting of the disciples, and the weekly breaking of the loaf in those meetings, stand or fall together. Hear it again: "And on the first day of the week, when the disciples assembled to break bread." Now all must confess, who regard the meaning of words, that the meeting of the disciples and the breaking of bread, as far as these words are concerned, are expressed in the same terms as respects the frequency. If the one was *fifty-two* times in a year, or only *once*; so was the other. If they met every first day, they broke the loaf every first day; and if they did not break the loaf every first day, they did not meet every first day. But we argue from the style of Luke, or from his manner of narrating the fact, that they did both. If he had said that on *a* first day the disciples assembled to break the loaf, then I would admit that both the Sabbatarians and the semi-annual or septennial communicants might find some way of explaining this evidence away.

The definite article is, in the Greek and in the English tongue, prefixed to stated and fixed times, and its appearance here is not merely definitive of one day, but expressive of a stated or fixed day. This is so in all languages which have a definite article. Let us illustrate this by a very parallel and plain case. Suppose some 500 or 1000 years hence the annual observance of the 4th of July should have ceased for several centuries, and that some person or persons devoted to the primitive institutions of this mighty Republic, were desirous of

seeing every 4th of July observed as did the fathers and founders of the Republic during the hale and undegenerate days of primitive republican simplicity. Suppose that none of the records of the first century of this Republic had expressly stated that it was a regular and fixed custom for a certain class of citizens to pay a particular regard to *every* fourth day of July; but that a few incidental expressions in the biography of the leading men in the Republic spake of it as Luke has done of the meeting at Troas. How would it be managed? For instance, in the life of John Q. Adams it is written, A. D. 1823, "And on the fourth of July, when the republicans at the City of Washington met to dine, John Q. Adams delivered an oration to them." Would not an American, a thousand years hence, in circumstances such as have been stated, find in these words *one* evidence that it was an established usage during the first century of this Republic to regard the 4th day of July as aforesaid. He would tell his opponents to mark that it was not said that on *a* fourth of July, as if it were a particular occurrence; but it was in the fixed meaning of the English language expressive of a fixed and stated day of peculiar observance. At all events, he could not fail in convincing the most stupid that the primary intention of that meeting was *to dine*. Whatever might be the frequency or the intention of that dinner, it must be confessed, from the words above cited, that they *met to dine*.

Another circumstance that must somewhat confound the Sabbatarians and the lawless observers of the breaking of the loaf, may be easily gathered from Luke's narrative. Paul and his company arrived at Troas either on the evening of the first day, or on Monday morning at an early hour; for he departed on Monday morning, as we term it, at an early hour; and we are positively told that he tarried just seven days at Troas. Now had the disciples been Sabbatarians, or observed the seventh day as a Sabbath, and broke the loaf on it as the Sabbatarians do, they would not have deferred their meeting till the first day, and kept Paul and his company waiting, as he was evidently in a great haste at this time. But his tarrying *seven* days, and his early departure on Monday morning, corroborates the evidence adduced in proof that the first day of the week was the *fixed* and *stated* day for the disciples to meet for this purpose.—*C.B. pp.* 211, 212.

From the 2d of the Acts, then, we learn that *the breaking of the loaf* was a stated part of the worship of the disciples in their meetings; and from the 20th we learn that the first day of the week was the stated time for those meetings; and, above all, we ought to notice that the most prominent object of their meeting was to break the loaf. Other corroborating evidences of the stated meeting of the disciples on the first day for religious purposes, are found in the fact that Paul says he had given orders to all the congregations in Galatia, as well as that in Corinth, to attend to the fellowship, or the laying up of contributions for the poor saints on the first day of every week. 1 Cor. xv. 1. "On the first day of *every week* let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have prospered, putting it into the treasury, that when I come there may be no collections" for the

saints. *Kata mian Sabbaton* Macknight justly renders, "*the first day of every week;*" for every linguist will admit that *kata polin* means every city; *kata menan*, every month; *kata ecclesian*, every church; and, therefore, in the same usage, *kata mian Sabbaton* means every first day of the week.

Now this prepares the way for asserting not only that the disciples in Troas assembled on the first day of every week for "the breaking of a loaf," but also for asserting a third argument:—

Argument 3. The congregation in Corinth met every first day, or the first day of every week, for showing forth the Lord's death. Let the reader bear in mind that he has just heard that Paul commanded the church in Corinth, or every saint in Corinth, to contribute according to his ability, by putting into the treasury every first day his contribution to avoid collections when Paul came. This is agreed on all hands to prove the weekly meeting of these saints. Now, with this concession in mind, we have only to notice what is said, chap. xii. 20. 'When you come together into one place, that is, every week at least, *this is not to eat the Lord's supper.* To act thus is unworthy of the object of your meeting. To act thus is not to eat the Lord's supper. It is not to show forth the Lord's death.' Thereby declaring that this is the chief object of meeting. When a teacher reproves his pupils for wasting time, he cannot remind them more forcibly of the object of their coming to school, nor reprove them with more point, than to say, 'When you act thus, this is not to assemble to learn.' This is the exact import of the Apostle's address, "When you assemble thus, it is *not* to eat the Lord's supper." We have seen, then, that the saints met every first day in Corinth; and when they assembled in one place it was to eat the Lord's supper, a declaration of the practice of the primitive congregations as explicit as could incidentally be given, differing only from a direct command in the form in which it is expressed. But it is agreed on all hands that whatsoever the congregations did with the approbation of the Apostles, they did by their authority. For the Apostles gave them all the christian institutions. Now as the Apostle Paul approbated their meeting every week, and their coming together into one place to shew forth the Lord's death;—and only censured their departure from the meaning of the institution, it is as high authority as we could require for the practice of the weekly meeting of the disciples.

But when Acts ii. 42. Acts xx. and 7. 1 Cor. xi. 2. and chap. xvi. 1 & 2, are compared and added together, it appears that we act under the influence of apostolic teaching and precedent when we meet every Lord's day for the breaking of the loaf. But this is still farther demonstrated by a fourth argument drawn from the following fact:—

Argument 4. *No example can be adduced from the New Testament of any christian congregation assembling on the first day of the week, unless for the breaking of the loaf.* Let an example be adduced by those who teach that christians ought to meet on the first day of the week not to break the loaf, and then, but not until then, can they impugn the above fact. Until this is done, a denial of it must appear

futile in the extreme. The argument, then, is, christians have no authority, nor are under any obligation to meet on the Lord's day from any thing which the Apostles said or practised, unless it be to show forth the Lord's death, and to attend to those means of edification and comfort connected with it.

Argument 5. If it be not the duty and privilege of every christian congregation on every first day of the week to assemble to show forth the Lord's death, it will be difficult, if not impossible, from either scripture or reason, to show that it is their duty or privilege to meet monthly, quarterly, semi-annually, annually, or, indeed, at all for this purpose. For from what premises can any person show that it is a duty or a privilege to assemble monthly, which will not prove that it is obligatory to meet weekly? We challenge investigation here, and affirm that no man can produce a single reason why it should or could be a duty or a privilege for a congregation to meet monthly, quarterly, or annually, which will not prove that its duty and privilege every first day of the week to assemble for this purpose.

Argument 6. Spiritual health, as well as corporeal health, is dependent on food. It is requisite for corporeal health that the food not only be salutary in its nature and sufficient in its quantity, but that it be received at proper intervals, and these regular and fixed. Is it otherwise with moral health? Is there no analogy between the bread which perishes, and the bread of life? Is there no analogy between natural and moral life—between natural and moral health? and if there be, does it not follow that if the primitive disciples only enjoyed good moral health when they assembled weekly to show forth the Lord's death, that they cannot enjoy good moral health who only meet quarterly or semi-annually for this purpose?

Argument 7. But in the last place, what *commemorative* institution, in any age, under any religious economy, was ordained by divine authority, which had not a fixed time for its observance? Was it the commemoration of the finishing of Creation signified in the weekly Sabbath? Was it the Passover, the Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles? Was it the Feast of Purim either? What other significant usage was it, the times or occasions of its observance were not fixed? How often was circumcision to be administered to the same subject? How often christian immersion? Is there a single institution commemorative of any thing, the meaning, or frequency, of the observance of which, is not distinctly, either by precept or example, laid down in the Holy Scriptures? Not one of a *social* character, and scarcely one of an individual character. The commemoration of the Lord's death must, then, be a weekly institution—an institution in all the meetings of the disciples for christian worship; or it must be an anomaly—a thing *sui generis*—an institution like no other of divine origin. And can any one tell why christians should celebrate the Lord's resurrection *fifty-two* times in a year, and his death only *once*, *twice*, or *twelve* times? He that can do this will not be lacking in a lively imagination, however defective he may be in judgment or in an acquaintance with the New Testament.

Having written so much on this subject formerly, I shall now introduce a few persons out of the many men of renown, who, since the Reformation, have plead this cause. We shall not only introduce them to our readers, but we shall let them speak to them:—

*John Brown*, of Haddington, author of the Dictionary of the Bible, and teacher of theology for that branch of the Presbyterian church called the "*Secession*," has written a treatise on this subject. We shall give him the task of stating and removing the objections to this apostolic institution. The reader will perceive that there are many impurities in his style; and although his speech betrays that he has been in Ashdod, still his arguments are weighty and powerful.

He offers various arguments for the weekly observance of this institution, and states and refutes nine objections to the practice. A few of the strongest we shall quote:—

"All the arguments I ever knew advanced in support of the unfrequent administration of the Lord's supper, appear to me altogether destitute of force. The following are the principal:—

"*Objection* 1. The frequent administration of this ordinance, in the apostolic and primitive ages of christianity, was commendable and necessary, because the continual persecutions that then raged gave them ground to fear every Sabbath might be their last; whereas now we are not in such danger, and therefore need not so frequent use of this ordinance.

"*Answer.* Ought we not still to live as if every Sabbath were to be our last? Have we now a lease of our life more than these had? Did not many christians in these times live to as great an age as we now do? Indeed, is it not evident, from the best historians, that the church was generally under no persecution above one-third part of the time that weekly communion was practised? But say they had been constantly exposed to the cruelest persecution, the objection becomes still more absurd. If they attended this ordinance weekly at the peril of their lives, does it not follow that now, when God gives us greater and better opportunity for it, we ought to omit it? Does God require the greatest work at his people's hands when he gives least opportunity? Or does he require least work when he gives the greatest opportunity for it? What kind of a master must God be if this were the case? Besides, do not men need this ordinance to preserve them from the influence of the world's smiles as much as of its frowns?"——"Let us invert this objection, and try if it has not more force. It would then run thus: The primitive christians received the Lord's supper weekly, as their souls were in greater danger from the smiles and allurements of the world, which are usually found more hurtful to men's spiritual concerns than its frowns; and as they had greater opportunity for doing so by their enjoying peace and liberty; yet this frequency of administering and partaking is not requisite now, as we, being under the world's frowns, are in less hazard as to our spiritual concerns; and especially, as we cannot attend upon it but at the peril of our lives, God having expressly declared that he loves mercy better than sacrifice.

"*Objection* 2. The primitive and reforming times were seasons of great spiritual liveliness, and of large communications of divine influences to the souls of believers; whereas it is quite otherwise now. Therefore, though frequent administration was then commendable; yet, in our languishing decayed state, it is unnecessary.

"*Answer.* Ought we to repair seldom to the wells of salvation, because we can bring but little water at once from them? Ought we seldom to endeavor to fill our pitchers at the fountain of living waters, because they are small? Is not this ordinance a cordial for restoring the languishing, strengthening the weak, recovering the sick, and reviving the dying believer? How reasonable

then, is it to argue that languishing, weak, sick, and dying believers, must not have it often administered to them, just because they are not in perfect health?" ——"Would not the objection inverted read better? The primitive christians had this ordinance frequently administered to them, because being decayed and withered, weak and sickly, and receiving only scanty communications of divine influence at once, it was necessary for them to be often taking new meals: whereas we being now strong and lively christians, and receiving on these occasions such large supplies of grace as are sufficient to enable us to walk many days under their powerful influence, have no occasion for so frequently attending on that ordinance, which is especially calculated for strengthening languishing, weak, sickly believers."

"*Objection* 3. If the Lord's supper were frequently administered, it would become less solemn, and, in time, quite contemptible, as we see is the case with baptism, through the frequency of the administration of that ordinance.

"*Answer.* Is this mean of keeping up the credit of the Lord's supper of God's devising or not? If it is, where is that part of his word that warrants it? The contrary I have already proved from Scripture. Since, then, it is only of men's invention, what ground is there to hope it will really maintain the credit and solemnity of the ordinance? Did not the Papists of old pretend to maintain and advance its solemnity, by reduction of the frequency of administration? Did they not take away the cup from the people, which Calvin says, was the native consequence of the former? Did they not annex the administration of this ordinance to those seasons which superstition had aggrandized; namely, Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas? Did they not annex a world of ceremonies to it? Did they not pretend that it was a real sacrifice, and that the elements were changed by consecration into the real body and blood of Christ? And, did all this tend to the support of the proper credit of this ordinance? On the contrary, did it not destroy it? Though the doctrine of transubstantiation procured a kind of reverence for it, yet, was this reverence divine? or, was it not rather devilish, in worshipping the elements? Now, how are we sure that our unfrequent administration of this ordinance will more effectually support its solemnity? Is it not strange that we should have so much encouragement from the practice of the Apostles, the primitive Christians, and the whole of the reformed churches, to profane this solemn ordinance; while the most ignorant and abandoned Papists are our original pattern for the course that tends to support its proper honor and credit? What a strange case this must be, if, in order to support the credit of God's ordinance, we must forsake the footsteps of the flock, and walk in the paths originally chalked out by the most ignorant and wicked antichristians?

"Besides, if our unfrequent administration of this ordinance render it solemn, would it not become much more so, if administered only once in seven, ten, twenty, thirty, sixty, or a hundred years?"——"Shall we not then find, that those who pray once-a month, or hear a sermon once-a-year, have their minds far more religiously impressed with solemn views of God, than those who pray seven times a day, and hear a hundred sermons within the year?"

"Let us invert this objection, and see how it stands. All human devices to render God's ordinances more solemn, are impeachments of his wisdom, and have always tended to bring the ordinances into contempt. But unfrequent administration of the supper is a human device, first invented by the worst of Papists, and therefore it tends to bring contempt on this ordinance, as we see sadly verified in the practice of those who voluntarily communicate seldom."

"*Objection* 4. The passover was administered but once-a-year; therefore the Lord's supper, which is come in its room, ought not to he administered more frequently."

"*Answer.* Was the passover a pattern for regulating the celebration of the supper by, or not? If it was, then, since nobody was required or allowed to eat the passover more than once-a-year, does it not follow that nobody is allowed to communicate more than once-a-year? Why, then, do we not warn our people of the sinfulness of communicating any oftener than once-a-year? If the passover

is to be our rule, why do we not attach also to the supper, seven days of unleavened bread?"

"*Objection 5.* Mr. Boston, and other great men, never administersd the supper more than once-a-year.

"Are not the Apostles, and many other great men among the ancients, together with Calvin, Luther, Owen, &c. nay, all the Protestant churches at home and abroad, particularly the church of Scotland in both her covenanting periods; our Books of Discipline; our Directory for worship, &c. all against him in that point? What is Mr. Boston's authority when laid in the balance with the authority of all these?"

The means by which the weekly observance of the Supper was set aside, Mr. Brown states in the following words:—

"The means by which the unfrequent administration of this ordinance appears to me to have been introduced into the church, do not savor of the God of truth. The causes that occasioned its introduction appear to have been pride, superstition, covetousness, and carnal complaisance. The eastern hermits, retiring from the society of men, had taken up their residence in deserts and mountains, and being far removed from the places of its administration, seldom attended. This though really the effect of their sloth and distance, they pretended to arise from their regard and reverence for this most solemn ordinance. It being easy to imitate them in this imaginary holiness, which lay in neglecting the ordinance of God, many of the eastern christians left off to communicate, except at such times as superstition had rendered solemn, as at pasch; and contented themselves with being spectators on other occasions. On account of this practice, we find the great and eloquent Chrysostom, once and again, bitterly exclaiming against them as guilty of the highest contempt of God and Christ; and calls their practice a most wicked custom."

"Further, the Christian people having got the supreme magistrate upon their side, thought themselves now more secure in the possession of their worldly wealth, and therefore were so much the more loath to part with it, in giving offerings every Sabbath. On these offerings the primitive ministers lived, and *out of them the elements were taken; and, as it was discreditable then to partake without offering, except the person were known to be very poor, too many chose rather, for the most part of the year, to abstain from the Lord's table, than part with a little of their beloved substance. If the people were churlish, the priests were equally covetous. Though they now began to have other funds assigned them for their subsistence, they were far from being willing to part with the ancient offerings; therefore, when they saw it was not possible to cause the people to bring them every Sabbath, they reduced the frequency of the administration of the supper, in expectation that the people would attend better, and bring larger offerings. And in order to inflame them the more powerfully to this, the clergy fixed the administration to times now consecrated by superstition, and began, by little and little, to persuade the people that their offerings were meritorious, and were a proper sacrifice for the atonement of their sins. Hence sprung at last that notion, that so much as was consecrated was turned into Christ's real body and blood, and was, as such, offered by the priests to atone for the sins of the quick and the dead.

"Besides, when the Christian church began to share the smiles and support of the Emperor and his court, multitudes, influenced by carnal motives, thronged into it, and the reins of discipline being now relaxed, they were easily admitted, though indeed many of them were far from being visible saints. These carnal and court Christians disliked being from week to week employed in self-examination, and other preparatory work, or living under the impression of so frequent solemn approaching to God. They also disliked the simplicity of this, as well as of other gospel ordinances, and were mightily fond that the Christian worship should be modelled as near to the Pagan and

**The offerings of the primitive Christians were usually presented in kind.*

Jewish forms as possible. The clergy, possessed with the same vitiated taste, and, besides, being very solicitous to procure themselves the favor of the great, transformed the Christian worship according to these patterns; and as the Pagans had in the year only a few solemn feasts in honor of their gods, and the Jews had only three solemn feasts, the feast of the Passover at Easter, the feast of Harvest at Pentecost, and the feast of Tabernacles, they appointed the supper to be administered to the people at Christmas, to supply the place of the feast of the Bacchanals, and at Easter and Pentecost, to supply the place of two of the Jewish feasts. However, this conforming of Christ's ordinance (as now indeed is also the case) did not procure due attendance on it, and therefore the clergy afterwards reduced the administration of it to the people to once, namely, Easter.

"By these means, and in this manner, it appears to me, from the hints of the history of these times which I can come to the knowledge of, was the unfrequency of the administration of the Lord's supper chiefly introduced. The clergy, however, pretended regard to the solemnity of the ordinance as the reason of all these alterations; and I doubt not but some good men were so blinded as to imagine that their conduct had a real tendency to produce this effect."

This work, which I never read until I opened it to make these extracts, making allowance for the style of an old-fashioned Presbyterian, contains much good argument on this subject, and is worthy of the perusal of such as are in doubt upon the necessity of the weekly celebration of the Supper.

An objection not formally stated by Mr. Brown, which I have frequently heard, is drawn from the words, "*as often as you do this*, do it in remembrance of me." From these words it is plead that we are without law in regard to the time how often; and consequently cannot be condemned for a partial or total neglect: for "where there is no law there is no transgression." "*As often*" is used not to license the frequency, but to denote the manner. Always do it in remembrance of me. The connexion in which these words occur regarding the manner or design of the observance, and not how often it may, or may not be celebrated, it is a violation of every rule of interpretation to infer another matter from them which was not in the eye of the Apostle. Besides, if the words "as oft" leave it discretionary with any society how often, they are blameless if they never once, or more than once in all their lives, show forth the Saviour's death. This interpretation makes an observance without reason, without law, without privilege, and consequently without obligation.

Next to Mr. Brown we shall introduce a few extracts from *William King*, Archbishop of Dublin. The Editors of the *Christian Examiner* presented a very valuable extract from Mr. King in their 7th or May number of the first volume, from which I quote the following, p. 163 165, 166, 167: —

"The following remarks on this institution of our Saviour, are copied from a "*Discourse concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*," by William King, of Ireland. He was born at Antrim 1650; educated at Trinity College, Dublin; and held successively the dignities of Dean of St. Patrick's, Bishop of Derry, and Archbishop of Dublin. He died in 1729. His method, in this "Discourse," is to examine and compare the worship of God, as taught in the Scriptures, with the practice of the different religious sects of the day:—

"Christ's positive command to do this in remembrance of him, &c. must oblige us in some times and in some places; and there can be no better way of determining when we are obliged to do it, than by observing when God in his goodness gives us opportunity; for either we are then obliged to do it, or else we may choose whether we will ever do it or no; there being no better means of determining the frequency than this of God's giving us the opportunity. And the same rule holding in all other general positive commands, such as in those that oblige us to charity, we may be sure it holds likewise in this.—Therefore whoever slights or neglects any opportunity of receiving which God affords him, does sin as certainly as he who, being enabled by God to perform an act of charity, and invited by a fit object, neglects to relieve him, or shuts up his bowels of compassion against him, concerning whom the Scriptures assure us, that the love of God dwells not in him. And the argument is rather stronger against him who neglects this holy ordinance; for how can it be supposed that man has a true love for his Saviour, or a due sense of his sufferings, who refuses or neglects to remember the greatest of all benefits, in the easiest manner, though commanded to do it by his Redeemer, and invited by a fair opportunity of God's own offering.

"It is manifest that if it be not our own faults, we may have an opportunity every Lord's day when we meet together; and therefore that church is guilty of laying aside the command, whose order and worship doth not require and provide for this practice. Christ's command seems to lead us directly to it: for, "Do this in remembrance of me," implies that Christ was to leave them, that they were to meet together after he was gone, and that he required them *to remember him at their meetings whilst he was absent.* The very design of our public meetings on the Lord's day, and not on the Jewish Sabbath, is, to remember and keep in our minds a sense of what Christ did and suffered for us till he come again; and this we are obliged to do, not in such a manner as our own inventions suggest, but by such means as Christ himself has prescribed to us, that is, by celebrating this holy ordinance.

"It seems then probable, from the very institution of this ordinance, that our Saviour designed it should be a part of God's service, in all the solemn assemblies of Christians, as the passover was in the assemblies of the Jews. To know, therefore, how often Christ requires us to celebrate this feast, we have no more to do, but to inquire how often Christ requires us to meet together; that is, at least, every Lord's day.

"And the same is further manifest, in the second place, from the examples of the Apostles, and of the churches of God, in the New Testament. They cannot be supposed but to have understood what Christ meant by these words, 'Do this in remembrance of me;' and if it appears that they did make this feast *a constant part of ordinary worship*, we may safely conclude that Christ meant it should be so. And here it is observable that we do not find any solemn stated meeting of Christians for worship in the whole New Testament without it.—

"When you come together, therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper; which intimates that one main design of their coming together, was and ought to have been to eat the Lord's supper; though by their misbehavior they so corrupted the ordinance, that it could not be called his Supper.

"If one should now reprove Christians, whom they observe to misbehave themselves in church, in these words, 'When you come together into one place, that is not to hear the word of God preached to you; for one is talking and another is sleeping;' would not every body conclude, that in the opinion of the reprover, the hearing of the word of God preached ought to be one end of their coming together? And surely, then, the Apostle's saying, that when you come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper, &c. gives us ground to conclude in his opinion, eating the Lord's Supper ought to be one constant end of our coming together. Which is further manifest from the advice he gives them, verse 33, "Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, tarry one for another." One end, therefore, of their coming together, was,

as children come together in a family at meal time, that is to be fed at their father's table: for what the Apostle called in the former verse coming together into one place, in this verse he calls coming together to eat; intimating that a main end of their coming together into one place was to eat."—

"I have endeavored all along to confine myself to the plain words of Scripture, and to use such arguments only, as the meanest might be able to judge of from their Bibles: yet in a controverted place of Scripture, concerning the meaning of a command of Christ, relating to some positive duty, I take the constant practice of the church, from the Apostles downward, to be a good means of determining the sense of it; and as there is not any example of a stated assembly for worship in the New Testament, without the Lord's Supper, so I think there is not any example of that nature in all antiquity. For the truth of this I appeal to those who are skilled in it. The nearer we come to the Apostles, we shall still find the Lord's Supper the more punctually observed, as a constant part of the ordinary service of the church; and it is remarkable that when some who had been present at the prayers and preaching of the church, began to go away without receiving, (which was a corruption that came in about 300 years after Christ,) it was so great an innovation and breach of the Scripture rule, that the church decreed whoever was guilty of it should be excommunicated. See particularly the 9th of those commonly called "the Canons of the Apostles," and the 2d Canon of the Council of Antioch. Thus the practice of the church continued for many ages. And though the generality of men could not be persuaded constantly to partake of the Lord's Supper, after the discipline of the church was dissolved, and the piety of men began to cool, yet still it was celebrated on the Lord's day, according to the first settled practice of the church.

"And, indeed, the corrupt practice of the solitary masses of the Papists, is a further evidence of its being counted originally a part of the ordinary worship of God. I think it is confessed by all, even by the priests themselves, that these masses had their origin from the universal corruption and negligence of Christians; for whilst the people had either piety or zeal, they communicated with the bishop or minister in every assembly, at least a competent number of them: but when piety and devotion were in a manner lost in the corrupt ages of the church, it came to pass that though the minister consecrated the elements every Lord's day, according to the example of the Holy Scriptures, and antiquity, yet he could prevail with few or none to receive with him, but was often forced to receive alone. This was a great corruption, and a falling from the Scripture precedent; but the Roman church, instead of reforming the abuse by obliging the people to receive as formerly, corrupted her principles as well as practice, and decreed it lawful and sufficient for the priest to receive alone. Yet this abuse shows us what should be, and what has been the practice; and that the church has constantly reckoned the Lord's Supper as an ordinary part of public worship in Christian assemblies on solemn days; and surely, then, to lay it aside can be termed no less than an invention of our own, since we can neither in Scripture, or in the church of God, for 1400 years together, (which is a sufficient commentary on the Scripture text,) produce one example of a stated solemn Christian assembly without it."

I was struck with the remarkable coincidence in the views exhibited by Mr. King on 1 Cor. xi. 20. and indeed with the whole of his views, and those exhibited in the Essays on "Breaking of Bread," published in the year 1825, in the 3d volume of the Christian Baptist; for we had never seen Mr. King's discourse, nor any part of it, until we saw the above Extract, taken from the Christian Examiner, published last summer.

We shall next introduce an American Rabbi of very great celebrity, Dr. John Mason, of New York. The passages which I quote

are found in a note attached to the 188th page of the New York Edition of Fuller's Strictures on Sandemanianism. We shall give the whole note—

"Mr. Fuller does not deny that the Lord's Supper was observed by the first christians every Lord's day, (nor will this be denied by any man who has candidly investigated the subject,) but he seems to think that Acts xx. 7. does not prove that it was so; others, eminent for piety and depth of research, have considered this passage as affording a complete proof of the weekly observance of the Lord's supper. Dr. Scott, in his valuable Commentary, observes on this passage, "*Breaking of bread,* or commemorating the death of Christ in the eucharist, was one chief end of their assembling; this ordinance seems to have been *constantly administered every Lord's day,* and probably no professed christians absented themselves from it after they had been admitted into the church; unless they lay under some censure, or had some real hindrance."

Dr. Mason, of this city, in his Letters on Frequent Communion, speaks on this subject with still greater decision. "It is notorious, that during the first three centuries of the christian era, communions were held with the frequency of which, among us, we have neither example nor resemblance. It is also notorious, that the original frequency of communions declined as carnality and corruption gained ground:—And it is no less notorious, that it has been urged as a weighty duty by the best of men, and the best churches, in the best of times.

"A brief illustration of these points, may not be unacceptable to the reader.

"As to the *first;* it is demonstrable, that among the primitive christians, the celebration of the supper was a part of the *ordinary sanctification of the Lord's day.*

"To begin with the Apostles. We learn from Acts xx. 7. that *on the first day of the week the disciples came together to break bread.* Hence it is evident, not only that christians assembled on the Lord's day for public worship, but that they did not part without commemorating his death. What else can be meant by breaking of bread? It is a phrase, borrowed from Christ himself, to signify the communion of the supper. And most assuredly his people did not assemble on his day for common or carnal purposes. Nay, it is intimated that sacramental communion was a *principal,* if not *the* principal object of their meeting. Prayer, praise, and preaching of the word, were, doubtless, their stated exercises; but of such moment was the supper considered, that in recording their employment on the sabbath, the sacred historian mentions nothing else—they came together *to break bread.* The argument must be decisive with all who allege this place to prove that the Apostolic Churches sanctified the first instead of the seventh day of the week. For the historian does not more positively say that they *came together,* than that they came together *to break bread.* Indeed, the strength of the argument drawn from this passage, to prove the change of the Sabbath, lies in the supposition that this "breaking of bread" signifies the sacrament of the supper; because it is the only expression from which we gather that the meeting of the disciples was both a *stated* one, and for *religious* ends. It is plain that they were not called together to hear the Apostle preach; but that he preached to them on the first day of the week, because they then came together, of course, *to break bread:* for he arrived at Troas the Monday preceding; and instead of assembling them as he might easily have done, he appears to have *waited six days,* that he might meet them on the *seventh,* which was the Lord's day. And designing to depart on the morrow, or Monday, he was so pressed for time that he protracted his sermon till midnight. All which difficulty he would have avoided by summoning the church in the foregoing week; but he chose rather to undergo it, than not give his apostolical sanction to the sanctification of the Lord's day, or lose the pleasure of joining with the brethren in commemorating his death. You must therefore admit either that this celebrated passage contains no proof that the primitive christians *habitually* sanctified the Lord's day; or that *weekly communions* were their constant practice.

"To the same purpose is the testimony of Paul 1 Cor. xi. 20. He had reproved the Corinthians for their scandalous dissensions in the place, and at the time, of public worship. *You come together*, says he,- *not for the better but for the worse. For when ye come together* IN THE CHURCH, I hear that there be divisions among you. ver. 17, 18. That these divisions occurred in their indecent manner of communicating, is undeniable. For with reference to them the Apostle proceeds, v. 20: *When ye come together therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper.* "By your shameful behaviour, the ordinance is so prostituted that it resembles nothing less than the supper of the Lord." The Apostle tells us, that their irregularities happened, *when they came together in the church*, and that the scene of them was the *table of the Lord.* Whence it follows, that the celebration of the supper was a regular concomitant of their stated meetings for public worship; and these, we know, were held at least *every Lord's day.* The conclusion results necessarily from the tenor of the Apostle's argument, 'which evidently supposes, that whenever they assembled together they came to eat the Lord's supper; for otherwise their coming together so as not to eat the Lord's supper, would be no proof that their coming together was for the worse. Weekly communions did not die with the Apostles and their cotemporaries. There is a cloud of witnesses to testify that they were kept up by succeeding christians, with great care and tenderness, for above two centuries. It is not necessary to swell these pages with quotations. The fact is indisputable.

"Communion every Lord's day, was universal, and was preserved in the Greek Church till the seventh century; and such as neglected *three weeks* together were excommunicated.

"In this manner did the spirit of ancient piety cherish the memory of the Saviour's love. There was no need of reproof, remonstrance, or entreaty. No trifling excuses for neglect were ever heard from the lips of a christian; for *such* a neglect had not yet degraded the christian's name. He carried in his own bosom sufficient inducements to obey, without reluctance, the precepts of his Lord. It was his choice, his consolation, his joy. These were days of life and glory; but days of dishonor and death were shortly to succeed; nor was there a more ominous symptom of their approach, than the decline of frequent communicating. For as the power of religion appears in a solicitude to magnify the Lord Jesus continually, so the decay of it is first detected by the encroachments of indifference. It was in the *fourth* century, that the church began very discernibly to forsake her first love."

"The excellent Calvin complains that in this day, professors, conceiting 'hey had fully discharged their duty by a single communion, resigned themselves for the rest of the year, to supineness and sloth. 'It ought to have been,' says he, 'far otherwise. *Every week*, at least, the table of the Lord should have been spread for christian assemblies; and the promises declared, by which, in partaking of it, we might be spiritually fed.'" *Mason's Letters on Frequent Communion, pages* 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, *and* 42, *Edinburgh Edition*, 1799.

We shall now hear the celebrated John Wesley. After *fifty-five* year's reflection upon the subject, he decides that christians should show forth the Lord's death every Lord's day. He prefaces the 106th Sermon, Luke xxii. 19. with this remark:

"This discourse was written above five and fifty years ago, for the use of my pupils at Oxford. I have added very little, but retracted much; as I then used more words than I now do. But I thank God, I have not yet seen cause to alter my sentiments, in any point which is therein delivered."

The Sermon is titled "The Duty of Constant Communion," concerning which the Reformer says—

"It is no wonder that men who have no fear of God, should never think of doing this. But it is strange that it should be neglected by any that do fear

God, and desire to save their souls; and yet nothing is more common. One reason why many neglect it is, they are so much afraid of *eating and drinking unworthily*, that they never think how much greater the danger is, when they do not eat or drink it at all."

In speaking of *constantly* receiving the supper, Mr. Wesley says—

"I say *constantly* receiving. For as to the phrase of *frequent* communion, it is absurd to the last degree. If it means any thing else than constant, it means more than can be proved to be the duty of any man. For if we are not obliged to communicate *constantly*, by what argument can it be proved that we are obliged to communicate frequently? yea, more than once a year? or once in seven years? or once before we die? Every argument brought for this, either proves that we ought to do it *constantly*, or proves nothing at all. Therefore that undeterminate, unmeaning way of speaking, ought to be laid aside by all men of understanding. Our power is the only rule of our duty. Whatever we can do, that we ought. With respect either to this, or any other command, he that, when he may obey if he will, does not, will have no place in the kingdom of heaven."

"The most common excuse for not obeying is, 'I am *unworthy;* and he *that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself.*— Therefore I dare not communicate, lest I should eat and drink my own damnation!"

In speaking of what Paul says of "eating and drinking unworthily," he observes—

"This is not our unworthiness: but the disorderly and unworthy manner of eating the supper—'one is *hungry*, and another is *drunken*.' But what is that to *you?* Is there any danger of *your* doing so? of your eating and drinking *thus unworthily?* However unworthy you are to communicate, there is no fear of your communicating thus —If then you fear bringing *damnation* on yourself by this, you fear where no fear is. Fear it not for eating and drinking unworthily; for that, in St. Paul's sense, you cannot do."

"An objection against constant communion is, that it abates our reverence for the sacrament. Suppose it did, what then? Will you thence conclude, that you are not to receive it constantly? This does not follow. God commands you 'do this.' You may do it now, but will not: and to excuse yourself say, 'If I do it so often, it will abate the reverence with which I do it now.' Suppose it did; has God ever told you, that when the obeying his command abates your reverence to it, then you may disobey it? If he has, you are guiltless; if not, what you say is just nothing to the purpose. The law is clear. Either show that the Lawgiver makes this exception, or you are guilty before him.

"The Church takes all possible care, that the sacrament be duly administered, wherever the Common Prayer is read, every Sunday and holy day in the year. The Church gives a particular direction with regard to those that are in holy orders: 'In all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Colleges, where there are many Priests and Deacons, they shall all receive the communion with the Priest, every Sunday at the least.'

"It has been shown, first, That if we consider the Lord's supper as a command of Christ, no man can have any pretence to christian piety, who does not receive it (not once a month, but) as often as he can: secondly, that if we consider the institution of it as a mercy to ourselves, no man who does not receive it as often as he can, has any pretence to christian prudence: thirdly, that none of the objections usually made, can be any excuse for that man who does not, at every opportunity, obey this command and accept this mercy."

Though we have some objections to the style in which John Wesley speaks of the meaning of this institution, as we have indeed to

that of all the others from whom we have quoted, yet we would recommend to the whole Methodistic community the close perusal of the above Sermon. It will be found vol. 3, p. 171—179.

The Elders among the Methodists, with whom John Wesley is such high authority, we would remind of his *advice*, found in his Letter to America, 1784, lately quoted in the Gospel Herald, Lexington, Ky. "I ALSO ADVISE THE ELDERS TO ADMINISTER THE SUPPER OF THE LORD ON EVERY LORD'S DAY."

So much for John Brown, John Mason, and John Wesley, and the authorities which they quoted. When quoting the sayings of the Johns, I am reminded of something said by the great John Milton, the "immortal bard" of England. In his posthumous works he says: "The Lord's supper (which the doctrine of transubstantiation, or rather anthropophagy, has well nigh converted into a banquet of cannibals) is not essential to be observed, and may be administered by any one with propriety, as well as by an appointed minister. There is no order of men which can claim to itself either the right of distribution, or the power of withholding the sacred elements, seeing that in the church we are all alike priests." "The master of a family, or any one appointed by him, is at liberty to celebrate the Lord's supper from house to house, as was done in the dispensation of the passover"—"all Christians are a royal priesthood, therefore any believer is competent to act as an ordinary minister according as convenience may require, provided only he be endowed with the necessary gifts, these gifts constituting his commission." Thus did the famous Milton make way for the weekly observance of the supper, by divesting it of the priestly appendages and penances of the dark ages.

A cloud of witnesses to the plainness and evidence of the New Testament on the subject of the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper, might be adduced. But this we think unnecessary; and as we would avoid prolixity and tediousness, we shall only add a few extracts from the 3d volume of the *Christian Baptist*, 2d ed. p. 254, in proof of the assertion *all antiquity is on the side of the disciples meeting every first day for the breaking of the loaf*:—

"I do not aim at prolixity, but at brevity, in discussing the various topics which are necessary to be introduced into this work. We are not desirous to show how much may be said on this or any other subject, but to show how little is necessary to establish the truth, and to say much in a few words. We shall not, then, dwell any longer on the scriptural authority for the weekly breaking of the loaf; but for the sake of those who are startled at what they call *innovation*," we shall adduce a few historical facts and incidents. We lay no stress upon what is no better than the traditions of the church, or upon the testimony of those called the *primitive* fathers, in settling any part of christian worship or christian obedience. Yet, when the Scriptures are explicit upon any topic which is lost sight of in modern times, it is both gratifying and useful to know how the practice has been laid aside and other customs been substituted in its room. There is, too, a corroborating influence in authentic history, which, while it does

not authorize any thing as of divine authority, it confirms the conviction of our duty in things divinely established, by observing how they were observed, and how they were laid aside.

"All antiquity concurs in evincing that, for the *three first centuries*, all the churches broke bread once-a-week. Pliny, in his Epistles, Book x. Justin Martyr, in his Second Apology for the Christians; and Tertullian, De Ora. page 135, testify that it was the universal practice in all the weekly assemblies of the brethren, after they had prayed and sang praises—"Then bread and wine being brought to the *chief brother*, he taketh it and offereth praise and thanksgiving to the Father, in the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit. After prayer and thanksgiving, the whole assembly saith, *Amen!* When thanksgiving is ended by the *chief guide*, and the consent of the whole people, the *deacons* (as we call them) give to every one present part of the bread and wine, over which thanks are given."

"The weekly communion was preserved in the Greek church till the *seventh century;* and, by one of their canons, "such as neglected *three weeks together*, were excommunicated."—Erskine's Dissertations, p. 271.

"In the *fourth century*, when all things began to be changed by baptized Pagans, the practice began to decline. Some of the councils in the western part of the Roman Empire, by their canons, strove to keep it up. The council held at Illiberis in Spain, A. D. 324, decreed that "no offerings should be received from such as did not receive the Lord's Supper."—Council Illib. Can. 28.

"The council at Antioch, A. D. 341, decreed that "all who came to church, and heard the Scriptures read, but afterwards joined not in prayer, and receiving the sacrament, should be cast out of the church till such time as they gave public proof of their repentance."—Council Antioch, Can. 2.

"All these canons were unable to keep a carnal crowd of professors in a practice for which they had no spiritual taste; and, indeed, it was likely to get out of use altogether. To prevent this, the Council of Agatha, in Languedoc, A. D. 506, decreed that "none should be esteemed good christians who did not *communicate* at least *three times* a-year—at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday."—Coun. Agatha, Can. 18. This soon became the standard of a good Christian, and it was judged presumptuous to commune oftener.

"Things went on in this way for more than 600 years, until they got tired of even *three* communications in one year; and the infamous Council of Lateran, which decreed auricular confession and transubstantiation, decreed that "an annual communion at Easter was sufficient." This association of the "sacrament" with Easter, and the mechanical devotion of the ignorant at this season, greatly contributed to the worship of the Host. Bingham's Ori. B. xv. C. 9. Thus the breaking of bread in simplicity and godly sincerity once-a-week, degenerated into a pompous sacrament once-a-year, at Easter.

"At the Reformation this subject was but slightly investigated by the reformers. Some of them, however, paid some attention to it.

Even Calvin, in his Institutes, lib. 4. chap. 17, 46, says, "And truly this custom, which enjoins communicating once-a-year, *is a most evident contrivance of the Devil*, by whose instrumentality soever it may have been determined."

"And again, (Ins. lib. 6. chap. xviii. sect. 56,) he says, "It ought to have been far otherwise. *Every week*, at least, the table of the Lord should have been spread for christian assemblies, and the promises declared, by which, in partaking of it, we might be spiritually fed."

"Martin Chemnitz, Witsius, Calderwood, and others of the reformers and controversialists, concur with Calvin; and, indeed, almost every commentator on the New Testament, concurs with the Presbyterian Henry in these remarks on Acts xx. 7. "In the primitive times it was the custom of many churches to receive the Lord's Supper every Lord's day."

"The Belgic reformed church, in 1581, appointed the supper to be received every other month. The reformed churches of France, after saying that they had been too remiss in observing the supper but four times a-year, advise a *greater frequency*. The church of Scotland began with *four* sacraments in a year; but some of her ministers got up to *twelve* times. Thus things stood till the close of the last century.

"Since the commencement of the present century, many congregations in England, Scotland, Ireland, and some in the United States and Canada, both Independents and Baptists, have attended upon the supper every Lord's day, and the practice is every day gaining ground.

"These historical notices may be of some use to those who are ever and anon crying out *Innovation! Innovation!* But we advocate the principle and the practice on apostolic grounds alone. Blessed is that servant, who, knowing his Master's will, doeth it with expedition and delight!

"Those who would wish to see an able refutation of the Presbyterian mode of observing the sacrament, and a defence of weekly communion, would do well to read Dr. John Mason's Letters on Frequent Communion, who is himself a high-toned Presbyterian, and consequently his remarks will be more regarded by his brethren than mine."

Thus our seventh proposition is sustained by the explicit declarations of the New Testament, by the reasonableness of the thing itself when suggested by the Apostles, by analogy, by the conclusions of the most eminent reformers, and by the concurrent voice of all christian antiquity. But on the plain sayings of the Lord and his Apostles, we rely for authority and instruction upon this and every other christian institution.

It does, indeed, appear somewhat incongruous that arguments should have to be submitted to urge christians weekly to convene around the Lord's table. Much more in accordance with the genius of our religion would it be to see them over-solicitous to be honored

with a seat at the King's table, and asking with intense interest might they be permitted so often to eat in his presence and in honor of his love. To have to withstand their daily convocations for this purpose, would not be a task so unnatural and so unreasonable, as to have to reason and expostulate with them to urge them to assemble once-a-week for this purpose.

But as the want of appetite for our animal sustenance is a symptom of ill health or approaching disease; so a want of relish for spiritual food is indicative of a want of spiritual health, or of the presence of a moral disease, which, if not healed, must issue in apostacy from the Living Head. Hence among the most unequivocal prognosis of a spiritual decline, the most decisive is a want of appetite for the nourishment which the Good Physician prepared and prescribed for his family. A healthy and vigorous christian, excluded from the use and enjoyment of all the provisions of the Lord's house, according to his ordination, cannot be found.

But much depends upon the *manner* of celebrating the supper, as well as upon the *frequency*. The simplicity of the christian institution runs through every part of it. While there is the form of doing every thing, there is all attention to the thing signified. But there is the form as well as the substance, and every thing that is done must be done in some manner. The well bred christian is like the well bred gentleman—his manners are graceful, easy, artless, and simple. All stiffness and forced formality is as graceless in the christian as in the gentleman. A courteous and polite family differs exceedingly from a soldier's mess mates, or a ship's crew, in all the ceremonies of the table. There is a christian decency and a christian order, as well as political courtesy and complaisance.

Nothing is more disgusting than mimickry. It is hypocrisy in manners, which, like hypocrisy in religion, is more odious than apathy or vulgarity? There is a saintishness in demeanor and appearance, which differs as much from sanctity as foppery from politeness. The appearance of sanctimoniousness is as much to be avoided as actual licentiousness of morals. An austere and rigid pharisaism sits as awkwardly upon a christian as a mourning habit upon a bride. Cheerfulness is not mirth—solemnity is not pharisaism—joy is not noise—nor eating, festivity.

But to act right in any thing, we must feel right. If we would show love, we must first possess it. If a person would walk humbly, he must be humble; and if one would act the christian on any occasion, he must always live the christian. Persons who daily converse with God, and who constantly meditate upon his salvation, will not need to be told how they should demean themselves at the Lord's table.

The following extract from my Memorandum Book furnishes the nighest approach to the model which we have in our eye, of good order and christian decency in celebrating this institution. Indeed, the whole order of that congregation was comely:—

'The church in —— consisted of about fifty members. Not having any persons whom they regarded as filling Paul's outlines of a Bishop, they had appointed two senior members, of a very grave deportment, to preside in their meetings. These persons were not competent to labor in the word and teaching; but they were qualified to rule well, and to preside with christian dignity. One of them presided at each meeting. After they had assembled in the morning, which was at eleven o'clock, (for they had agreed to meet at eleven and to adjourn at two o'clock during the Winter season,) and after they had saluted one another in a very familiar and cordial manner, as brethren are wont to do who meet for social purposes; the president for the day arose and said: "Brethren, being assembled in the name and by the authority of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, on this day of his resurrection, let us unite in celebrating his praise." He then repeated the following stanza:—

*"Christ the Lord is risen to-day!*
*Sons of men and angels say;*
*Raise your joys and triumphs high,*
*Sing, O heavens! and earth reply!"*

'The congregation arose and sang this psalm in animating strains. He then called upon a brother, who was a very distinct and emphatic reader, to read a section of the evangelical history. He arose and read, in a very audible voice, the history of the crucifixion of the Messiah. After a pause of a few moments, the president called upon a brother to pray in the name of the congregation. His prayer abounded with thanksgivings to the Father of Mercies, and with supplications for such blessings on themselves and for all men as were promised to those who ask, or for which men were commanded to pray. The language was appropriate; no unmeaning repetitions, no labor of words, no effort to say any thing and every thing that came into his mind; but to express slowly, distinctly, and emphatically, the desires of the heart. The prayer was comparatively short; and the whole congregation, brethren and sisters, pronounced aloud the final *Amen.*

'After prayer a passage in one of the Epistles was read by the president himself, and a song was called for. A brother arose, and after naming the page, repeated—

*"'Twas on that night when doom'd to know*
*The eager rage of every foe;*
*That night in which he was betray'd*
*The Saviour of the world took bread."*

'He then sat down, and the congregation sang with much feeling.

'I observed that the table was furnished before the disciples met in the morning, and that the disciples occupied a few benches on each side of it, while the strangers sat off on seats more remote. The president arose and said that our Lord had a table for his friends, and that he invited his disciples to sup with him. 'In memory of his death, this monumental table,' said he, 'was instituted; and as the Lord ever lives in heaven, so he ever lives in the hearts of his people. As the first disciples, taught by the Apostles in person, came together into

one place to eat the Lord's supper, and as they selected the first day of the week in honor of his resurrection for this purpose; so we, having the same Lord, the same faith, the same hope with them, have vowed to do as they did. We owe as much to the Lord as they; and ought to love, honor, and obey him as much as they. Thus having spoken, he took a small loaf from the table, and in one or two periods gave thanks for it. After thanksgiving, he raised it in his hand, and significantly brake it, and handed it to the disciples on each side of him, who passed the broken loaf from one to another, until they all partook of it. There was no stiffness, no formality, no pageantry; all was easy, familiar, solemn, cheerful. He then took the cup in a similar manner, and returned thanks for it, and handed it to the disciple sitting next him, who passed it round; each one waiting upon his brother, until all were served. The thanksgiving before the breaking of the loaf, and the distributing of the cup, were as brief and as pertinent to the occasion as the thanks usually presented at a common table for the ordinary blessings of God's bounty. They then arose, and with one consent, sang—

*"To him that lov'd the sons of men,*
*And wash'd us in his blood;*
*To royal honors rais'd our heads,*
*And made us priests to God."*

'The president of the meeting called upon a brother to remember the poor and those ignorant of the way of life, before the Lord. He kneeled down and the brethren all united with him in supplicating the Father of Mercies in behalf of all the sons and daughters of affliction, the poor and the destitute, and in behalf of the conversion of the world. After this prayer the fellowship, or contribution, was attended to; and the whole church proved the sincerity of their desires by the cheerfulness and liberality which they seemed to evince in putting into the treasury as the Lord had prospered them.

'A general invitation was tendered to all the brotherhood if they had any thing to propose or inquire, tending to the edification of the body. Several brethren arose in succession, and read several passages in the Old and New Testaments relative to some matters which had been subjects of former investigation and inquiry. Sundry remarks were made; and after singing several spiritual songs selected by the brethren, the president, on motion of a brother who signified that the hour of adjournment had arrived, concluded the meeting by pronouncing the apostolic benediction.

'I understood that all these items were attended to in all their meetings; yet the order of attendance was not invariably the same. On all the occasions on which I was present with them, no person arose to speak without invitation, or without asking permission of the president, and no person finally left the meeting before the hour of adjournment, without special leave. Nothing appeared to be done in a formal or ceremonious manner. Every thing exhibited the power of godliness as well as the form; and no person could attend to all that passed without being edified and convinced that the Spirit of God was there. The joy, the affection, and the reverence which appeared in this little assembly, was the strongest argument in favor of their order, and the best comment on the excellency of the christian institution.'

# INDEX TO VOL. I.


A.

| | Page. |
|---|---|
| Africa, a new Tribe in | 381 |
| American Bible Society | 74 |
| Anathema of E. Rogers | 456 |
| Anatomy a Cure for Religion | 71 |
| Ancient Gospel Agent of Revolution | 5 |
| Andrew Fuller's Previous Principle | 137 |
| Anti-Campbellism | 118 |
| Anti-Reformers, injustice of | 258 |
| Appomattox Decrees | 261 |
| Argumentum ad Hominem | 328 |
| Assyrian History, outline of | 210 |
| Associations, Proscriptions, &c. | 416 |

B.

| | |
|---|---|
| Baptism for Remission, by John | 141 |
| ——— by Immersion in a church | 226 |
| Baptismal Vow | 475 |
| Baptist Chronicle, slanders of | 286 |
| ——— order of things not the ancient order of things | 270 |
| ——— Statistics | 59 |
| Baxter against Immersion | 26 |
| Beaver Anathema | 174 |
| Bishops, Title abused | 427 |
| Blessings of Slavery | 96 |
| Booth Abraham on the popular mode of preaching | 512 |
| Bracken Minutes, Extract from | 477 |
| Broaddus Andrew, Reply to | 229 |
| Brown R. T. to H. Grew | 361 |
| Brantly and Clopton, misstatements of | 431 |
| ——— and the Extra | 462 |
| Bunyan's Pilgrim, Merit of | 169 |

C.

| | |
|---|---|
| Calumny Detected | 450 |
| Campbellism | 116 |
| Carlile's Life of Paine | 394 |
| Channing on Fenelon | 406 |
| Chillingsworth's View of the Word | 264 |
| Cherokee Indians | 44 |
| Christian Spirit | 170 |
| Experience, No. I. | 259 |
| No. II. | 359 |
| No. III. | 422 |

C.

| | |
|---|---|
| Christian Experience, No. IV. | 498 |
| Proscription | 430 |
| Contrast | 363 |
| Messenger | 473 |
| Christianos & the Eighth of Romans | 111 |
| Criticism of, on the participle | 150 |
| ——— | 151 |
| Remarks upon | 152 |
| Defence of himself | 217 |
| Reply to | 229 |
| Christian, the name | 370 |
| Circular of E. Rogers | 17 |
| Reviewed | 64 |
| Clay Henry, Extract of a speech | 36 |
| Clack Spencer, Letter from | 120 |
| Reply to | 122 |
| Letter from | 265 |
| Reply to | 268 |
| Letter from | 289 |
| Reply to | 292 |
| Clopton Abner W. | 98 |
| Reply to | 103 |
| Strictures on C. B. | 159 |
| Reply to | 165 |
| His No. II. | 272 |
| Nos. III.-IV. | 378 |
| No. V. | 540 |
| Colonies, first settlement of | 47 |
| Conclusion of Vol. I. | 573 |
| Confirmation of the Testimony | 8 |
| Confession to Salvation | 28 |
| Contributions for the Gospel | 90 |
| Converse and Clopton | 25 |
| Cooper Dr. of Mississippi, Letter from | 287 |
| Creeds and Confessions of Faith | 207 |

D.

| | |
|---|---|
| Danger of Telling the Truth | 47 |
| Daniel on the Prophecies, No. I. | 373 |
| Deceiving and being Deceived | 215 |
| " " " | 334 |
| Dialogue on Associations | 439 |
| Between a Jew and the Editor | 561 |
| Double Sense of Scripture | 38 |

| | Page. |
|---|---|
| Dydimus | 442 |
| **E.** | |
| Ecclesiastical Authorities in favor of the Christian Remission | 468 |
| Education, No. I. | 248 |
| No. II. | 251 |
| No. III. | 320 |
| Egyptian History, outline of | 181 |
| Elihu on the Spirit | 368 |
| Emancipation of White Slaves | 128 |
| Endemick Religious | 227 |
| Episcopalian Witness against Catechisms | 31 |
| Extract of a Circular Letter | 34 |
| Experience of R. B. Semple | 133 |
| of A. Campbell a dangerous ground of confidence | 137 |
| | 639 |
| Extract of a letter from Mathews | 139 |
| Extraordinary longevity | 191 |
| Extract from a letter from W. S. | 479 |
| **F.** | |
| F. letter from | 199 |
| " | 371 |
| Faith the belief of testimony | 9 |
| Confession of | 362 |
| Facts, Testimony and Faith, connected | 9 |
| Fanaticism, horrid | 96 |
| Fisk Pliny—Extract from | 527 |
| Francke Professor—Conversion of | 495 |
| Remarks on | 497 |
| Francis, Journal of his Tour | 341 |
| " " " | 389 |
| " " " | 443 |
| Fullerism exposed, No. I. | 454 |
| Fullerism and Sandemanianism exposed, No. II. | 481 |
| No. III. | 536 |
| No. IV. | 568 |
| **G.** | |
| Georgia Slaves | 47 |
| Gill Dr. placed among the Mystics by I. M. Peck | 476 |
| Grew Henry—on Faith | 233 |
| to R. T. Brown | 492 |
| **H.** | |
| Haddon on J. Vardeman | 332 |
| Health, true sources of | 279 |
| Hints to the Proclaimers of the Ancient Gospel | 366 |
| Historical Sketch | 214 |
| Henley Thomas M. letter from | 450 |
| to Bishop Semple | 521 |
| Holiness true | 325 |
| Hope Samuel, of Liverpool | 176 |
| **I.—J.** | Page. |
| Incompetency of the Baptist System | 87 |
| Indians, removal of | 257 |
| Infant Schools | 248 |
| Innovations | 311 |
| Irving, Heterodoxy of | 382 |
| Jason to the Editor | 534 |
| John the Harbinger | 49 |
| Journal of a Traveller | 341 |
| " " | 389 |
| " " | 443 |
| July the Fourth, celebration of | 299 |
| An Oration in honor of | 301 |
| Judaizers, No. I. | 88 |
| Justice demanded from Mr. Brantly and others | 97 |
| **K.** | |
| Keeling H. Editor of the Herald | 288 |
| Kentucky Anti-Slavery | 36 |
| **L.** | |
| Letter to the Editor from Eastport, Maine | 63 |
| from C. Schultz | 91 |
| Spencer Clack | 120 |
| R. B. Semple | 132 |
| Aylett Rains | 148 |
| T. of Essex, Va. | 188 |
| N. of Mathews, Va. | 223 |
| Henry Grew | 233 |
| Andrew Broaddus | 217 |
| T. M. of Buckingham, Va. | 283 |
| A Baptist, Philadelphia | 283 |
| A Baptist Preacher | 330 |
| A sister in an Eastern City | 377 |
| Letters from the Editor to Spencer Clack | 122 |
| to R. B. Semple | 135 |
| to Andrew Broaddus | 229 |
| Henry Grew | 235 |
| N. of Mathews | 239 |
| Letter from Samuel Hope to Dr. Glendy | 276 |
| Living and Effectual Word | 333 |
| **M.** | |
| Mahoning Association | 414 |
| Man of a hundred years | 310 |
| Mason James, letter from | 274 |
| Mayslick Baptist Resolution | 571 |
| Remarks on | 572 |
| Mayslick Meeting | 238 |
| Marshal Humphrey, letter to, | |
| No. I. | 513 |
| No. II. | 529 |

M.

Page.

Medo-Persian Empire, outlines of its History 385
" " " 435
" " " 508
Millennium, No. I. 53
No. II. 145
No. III. 311
Thoughts on 364
" " 405
Miscellanea 46
Miscellaneous remarks on letters 285
Missionaries, mistake of 429
Misstatement corrected 237
Mistakes detected 364
" " 405
Monkery, rise of 93
Monthly Receipts 48
— 96
— 144
— 192
— 239
— 288
— 341
— 383
— 432
— 528

N.

Noel Silas M. a Presbyterian Baptist 157

O.

Octoganary 227
Oration in honor of July Fourth 301
Oriole on the Wise and Foolish Woman 193

P.

Paul's First Work, or John Taylor a Reformer 263
Philalethes on God's Instrument of Instruction 276
on the Scriptures 297
— 337
— 398
— 422
— 532
Philip on True Holiness 325
Plagiarism 95
Platforms of sects weak and narrow 56
Predictions of Ezra Stiles, D. D. 525
Prefatory Remarks 3
Presbyterianism, inefficiency of 349
Prophecies by Daniel, No. I. 373
No. II. 416
No. III. 458
No. IV. 501
No. V. 504

P.

Page.

Proscription and the Franklin Creed 376
Prospectus 1
Public Speakers, delineation of by Philip 419
Pulpit Eloquence 143

Q.

Queries 155

R.

Radical, a letter from 209
Rains Aylett, letter from 148
Randolph Stone 16
Reformers, character of 49
imprudence of 258
hints to 321
Regenerated Unbeliever 19
Regeneration, Discipulus on, No. I. 203
No. II. 205
No. III. 255
No. IV. 323
No. V. 395
No. VI. 471
No. VII. 517
Metaphysical, No. I. 454
No. II. 481
No. III. 536
No. IV. 568
Dr Cox on 546
Religious Controversy 40
Request for information on the History of the Reformation 429
Review of John Taylor 241
Rise of Monkery 93
Romans, 8th Chapter to, examined 111
Rousseau's opinion of the Bible 526
Rule of Life of Columbian Star 81

S.

Sceptical Enthusiasm 71
Schultz C. letter from 91
Scheme for gradual Abolition 189
Scott Walter, to Mahoning Association 34
Scrutator on R. B. Semple 490
Semple R. B. Letter from 132
Letter to 135
Letter to 178
Letter from 351
Letter to 353
Serious Calculation 85
Sin, history of, No. I. 106
No. II. 181
No. III. 210
No. IV. 385
No. V. 435
No. VI. 508
Smith Elias 550

| S. | Page. |
|---|---|
| Spiritual Body | 485 |
| Statistics of Presbyterians | 348 |
| Stephen on Public Speakers | 425 |
| Stone Barton W. | 334 |
| Strictures on Abner W. Clopton | 230 |
| Summary of Baptists | 215 |
| Support of the Gospel | 225 |
| Symbolic and Prophetic Language | 69 |
| T. | |
| Taylor John's Campbellism Exposed, Reviewed by *Ajax* | 314 |
| Testimony of Members of Clear Creek, vs. John Taylor | 380 |
| of a Methodist brother | 209 |
| Times, No. I. | 433 |
| Tobacco, deleterious influence of | 281 |
| T. | Page. |
| Tour to Nashville, Incidents of No. I. | 563 |
| Tracts converting means | 61 |
| U. | |
| Universalism and Atheism | 144 |
| Universality of Taxation | 382 |
| V. | |
| Vantage Ground | 14 |
| Voice and Word of God | 124 |
| W. | |
| Welch James E. Notice of | 140 |
| Western Pioneer | 476 |
| Western Intelligencer | 16 |
| Winter John, of Beaver | 174 |
| Winter, an impostor | 176 |
| Word to Mr. Brantly | 178 |
| World governed by names | 79 |


## INDEX TO EXTRA NO I.


| | Page. |
|---|---|
| Ancient christians were said to be justified | 4 |
| sanctified | ib. |
| reconciled | 5 |
| adopted | ib. |
| saved | 6 |
| Apostolical Fathers testify that immersion and regeneration were convertible terms | 42 |
| Baptist creed confirmatory | 49 |
| Barnabas, testimony of | 43 |
| Begotten and born again, distinguished | 29 |
| Clements' testimony | 43 |
| Conclusion | 55 |
| Conversion sometimes convertible with immersion | 16 |
| Criticisms on the commission | 18 |
| Cyprian, testimony of | 47 |
| Episcopalian creed confirmatory | ib. |
| Faith changes not a person's state | 3 |
| Gospel command and obedience | 12 |
| Hermas, testimony of | 43 |
| Immersion and regeneration in one sense convertible | 2 |
| first duty of a believer | 35 |
| In and Into contrasted and explained | 10 |
| | Page. |
| Justyn Martyr, testimony of | 44 |
| Methodist creed confirmatory | 49 |
| No Theorist | 23 |
| Origen's testimony | 46 |
| Objections | 52 |
| Presbyterian confession corroborative | 48 |
| Question on the wisest decision | 38 |
| Recapitulation | 54 |
| Remission under the law imperfect | 1 |
| perfect under the New Constitution a fundamental principle | 3 |
| Remission, forgiveness and justification synonimous in the Epistles | 4 |
| Regeneration, political, an illustration | 32 |
| Sophistry of opponents detected | 37 |
| State and character discriminated | 8 |
| Tertullian, testimony of | 45 |
| Washing away sin, how ascribed to water | 40 |
| Wall Dr. testimony of | 44 |
| Wesley John, testimony of | 50 |
| — | |
| Extra on Breaking the Loaf | 61 |